

EXHIBIT D

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

3 MATTHEW BISONNETTE,)
4 Plaintiff)
5 -against-) Civil Action No.
6 KEVIN PODLASKI and)
7 CARSON BOXBERGER, LLP,)
Defendants)

DEPOSITION OF KEVIN PODLASKI

13 The deposition upon oral examination of KEVIN
14 PODLASKI, a witness produced and sworn before me, Karen K.
15 Keim, CRR, RPR, CSR-IL, CCR-MO, Notary Public, taken at
16 Kightlinger & Gray, LLP, One Indiana Square, Suite 300, 211
17 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, on
18 November 17, 2016, and scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m.

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

INDEX		
1	EXAMINATION	
2	Witness Name	Page
3	KEVIN PODLASKI	
4	Direct By Mr. Randy Johnston	8
5	EXHIBITS	
6	Exhibit	Description
7	Exhibit 14	Ends with January 12 email from Elyse 83 Cheney to Richard Heller (Marked and can be found attached to the deposition of Mr. Bissonnette)
8	Exhibit 31	Deposition Notice
9	Exhibit 32	Deposition Notice
10	Exhibit 33	Unsigned copy of Engagement Letter with
11		10 Matthew Bissonnette
12	Exhibit 34	Carson Boxberger bills
13	Exhibit 35	12 MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD
14	Exhibit 36	32 Email: String ends with January 17, 2012;
15		37 Re Retainer Agreement
16	Exhibit 37	Email: String ends with September 20,
17		56 2012, Re: attorney client privileged
18		communciation and attorney work product
19	Exhibit 38	Email: Ends with 1/19/2012 4:25 p.m. 62 email from Kevin Podlaski to Elyse
20		Cheney; Subject FW: Penguin books/
21	Exhibit 39	Additional page of Memorandum of Record
22	Exhibit 40	102 Januay 18, 2012 11:51 a.m. memo from 114 Kevin Podlaski to Kevin Podlaski;
23		Subject: Penguin Books
24	Exhibit 41	Ends with 1/21/2012 10:48 a.m. email from
25		117 Kevin Podlaski to Elyse Cheney
26	Exhibit 42	Ends with 2/6/2012 3:02 p.m. email from
27		118 Elyse Cheney to Kevin Podlaski
28	Exhibit 43	Ends with 2/6/2012 5:47 p.m. email from
29		119 Elyse Cheney to Kevin Podlaski
30	Exhibit 44	January 16, 2012 5:20 p.m. email from 121 Elyse Cheney to Kevin Podlaski; Subject:
31		FW: Marc contract
32	Exhibit 45	June 23, 2012 1:34 p.m. email from Ben
33		124 Sevier to Kevin Podlaski; Subject: file
34	Exhibit 46	June 27, 2012 3:21 p.m. email from Krista
35		127 J. Witmer to Kevin Podlaski
36	Exhibit 47	June 28, 2012 9:58 a.m. email from Alex
37		128 Jacobs to Kevin Podlaski and Elyse Cheney
38	Exhibit 48	June 29, 2012 4:52 p.m. email from Alex
39		129 Jacobs to Kevin Podlaski

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

1	EXHIBITS (cont'd.)		
2	Exhibit 49	June 29, 2012 6:08 p.m. email from Kevin Podlaski to AB: Jacobs Alex	135
3	Exhibit 50	Ends with 7/3/2012 4:00 p.m. email from Ben Sevier to Kevin Podlaski	137
4	Exhibit 51	Handwritten cover sheet and press release	138
5	Exhibit 52	Ends with August 20, 2012 7:19 p.m. email from Elyse Cheney to Kevin Podlaski	139
6	Exhibit 53	Ends with August 23, 2012 4:19 p.m. email from Elyse Cheney to Christine Ball and others	139
7	Exhibit 54	Ends with August 23, 2012 5:03 p.m. email from Elyse Cheney to Kevin Podlaski	142
8	Exhibit 55	Ends with August 23, 2012 6:44 p.m. email from Elyse Cheney to Kevin Maurer and Kevin Podlaski	145
9	Exhibit 56	Ends with August 25, 2012 10:09 a.m. email from Kevin Podlaski to Kevin Podlaski	145
10	Exhibit 57	Ends with August 26, 2012 9:35 p.m. g-mail from Kevin Podlaski to Mark Owen	147
12	Exhibit 58	Ends with August 26, 2012 9:14 p.m. email from Kevin Podlaski to MO	148
13	Exhibit 59	Ends with August 27, 2012 11:29 a.m. email from Diana Bauer to Kevin Podlaski	149
14	Exhibit 60	Ends with August 27, 2012 4:17 p.m. email from Elyse Cheney to Kevin Podlaski	151
15	Exhibit 61	Ends with August 27, 2012 5:39 p.m. email from Christine Ball to Christine Ball and others	156
16	Exhibit 62	Ends with August 27, 2012 4:32 p.m. email from Brian Tart to Elyse Cheney and others	158
18	Exhibit 63	Ends with August 27, 2012 5:43 p.m. email from Kevin Podlaski to Christine Ball and others	161
19	Exhibit 64	Ends with August 28, 2012 3:52 p.m. email from Ben Sevier to Kevin Podlaski	163
21	Exhibit 65	Ends with August 28, 2012 11:59 a.m. email from Kevin Podlaski to Mark Owen	165
22	Exhibit 66	Ends with August 29, 2012 12:41 p.m. email from Mark Owen to Kevin Podlaski	168
23	Exhibit 67	Ends with August 30, 2012 9:49 a.m. email from Mark Owen to Kevin Podlaski	169
24	Exhibit 68	Ends with August 30, 2012 10:59 a.m. email from Mark Fabiani to Kevin Podlaski and others	170
25	Exhibit 69	Ends with August 30, 2012 11:50 p.m. email	179

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

1 EXHIBITS (cont'd.)
2

3 Exhibit 70 Ends with August 30, 2012 4:21 email from 181
4 Ben Sevier to Kevin Podlaski
5 Exhibit 71 Ends with August 31, 2012 10:45 email 187
from Robert Luskin to Kevin Podlaski
6 Exhibit 72 Ends with August 31, 2012 10:53 a.m. 190
email from Robert Luskin to Kevin
7 Podlaski
8 Exhibit 73 Ends with August 31, 2012 11:56 a.m. 191
email from Ben Sevier to Kevin Podlaski
and others
9 Exhibit 74 Ends with August 31, 2012 1:47 p.m. email 192
from Kevin Podlaski to Robert Luskin
10 Exhibit 75 Ends with August 31, 2012 7:52 p.m. email 193
from Kevin Podlaski to Elyse Cheney
11 Exhibit 76 Ends with August 31, 2012 12:09 p.m. 194
email from Robert Luskin to Kevin
Podlaski
12 Exhibit 77 Ends with August 31, 2012 12:29 p.m. email 195
from Kevin Podlaski to Mark Owen
13 Exhibit 78 Ends with August 31, 2012 12:37 a.m. 197
email from Ben Sevier to Mark Owen
14 Exhibit 79 Ends with September 2, 2012 5:57 p.m. 197
email from Kevin Podlaski to Kevin
Podlaski
15 Exhibit 80 September 4, 2012 9:46 am email from 198
Kevin Podlaski to Mark Owen
16 Exhibit 81 Ends with September 4, 2012 4:28 p.m. 199
email from Elyse Cheney to Kevin Podlaski
17 Exhibit 82 Ends with September 5, 2012 12:13 p.m. 200
email from Kevin Podlaski to Kevin
Podlaski
18 Exhibit 83 September 6, 2012 memorandum to Kevin 202
Podlaski from Diana C. Bauer
19 Exhibit 84 September 6, 2012 memorandum to FILE from 203
Kevin Podlaski
20 Exhibit 85 Ends with September 6, 2012 3:51 p.m. 204
email from Diana Bauer to Kevin Podlaski
21 Exhibit 86 Ends with September 7, 2012 8:53 a.m. 206
email from Kevin Podlaski to Diana Bauer
22 Exhibit 87 Ends with September 7, 2012 2:16 p.m. 208
email from Diana Bauer to Kevin Podlaski
23 Exhibit 88 September 7, 2012 letter from Kevin P. 208
Podlaski to Department of Defense
24 Exhibit 89 September 18, 2012 letter from Kevin 209
Podlaski to Susan Cugler
25 Exhibit 90 Document to Susan Aldorfer from Kevin 209

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

1 EXHIBITS (cont'd.)
2

3	Exhibit 91	Ends with September 8, 2012 9:46 p.m. 210 email from Mark Owen to Kevin Podlaski
4	Exhibit 92	Ends with September 11, 2012 10:50 a.m. 212 email from Elyse Cheney to Kevin Podlaski and others
5	Exhibit 93	Ends with September 11, 2012 4:46 p.m. 214 email from Robert Luskin to Kevin Podlaski and Mark Fabiani
6	Exhibit 94	Ends with September 12, 2012 1:37 p.m. 217 email from Kevin Podlaski to Kevin Podlaski
7	Exhibit 95	Ends with September 13, 2012 12:04 p.m. 218 email from Diana Bauer to Kevin Podlaski
8	Exhibit 96	Ends with September 18, 2012 3:53 p.m. 220 email from Mark Owen to Kevin Podlaski and Elyse Cheney
9	Exhibit 97	Ends with September 18, 2012 7:00 p.m. 223 email from Kevin Podlaski to Mark Owen
10	Exhibit 98	Ends with September 24, 2012 3:34 email 224 from Mark Owen to Kevin Podlaski
11	Exhibit 99	Ends with September 28, 2012 9:23 a.m. 225 email from Robert Luskin to Kevin Podlaski
12	Exhibit 100	Ends with October 5, 2012 5"56 p.m. email 226 from Mark Owen to Kevin Podlaski
13	Exhibit 101	Ends with November 13, 2012 10:49 a.m. 229 email from David Sobonya to Kevin Podlaski
14	Exhibit 102	Ends with January 8, 2013 1:48 p.m. email 231 from Kevin Maurer to Kevin Podlaski
15	Exhibit 103	Ends with May 8, 2013 2:18 p.m. email 232 from Alex Jacobs to Kevin Podlaski
16	Exhibit 104	Ends with May 8, 2013 3:41 email from 233 Krista J. Witmer to Kevin Podlaski
17	Exhibit 105	Ends with May 9, 2013 7:56 a.m. email 234 from Donald Nichelson to Kevin Podlaski
18	Exhibit 106	Ends with May 9, 2013 10:10 a.m. email 232 from Alex Jacobs to Kevin Podlaski
19	Exhibit 107	Ends with May 9, 2013 4:21 p.m. email 236 from Mark Owen to Kevin Podlaski
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

1 A P P E A R A N C E S
2

3 FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

4 Mr. Randy Johnston
5 Mr. Coyt Johnston
6 JOHNSTON TOBEY BARUCH, P.C.
7 3308 Oak Grove Avenue
8 Dallas, Texas 75204
9 214.741.6260
10 randy@jtlaw.com

11 FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

12 Mr. A. Michael Furman
13 Ms. Izabell Lemkhen
14 FURMAN KORNFELD & BRENNAN LLP
15 61 Broadway, 26th Floor
16 New York, New York 10006
17 212.867.4100
18 mfurman@fkblaw.com

19 Mr. Michael E. Brown
20 KIGHTLINGER & GRAY, LLP
21 One Indiana Square, Suite 300
22 211 North Pennsylvania Street
23 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
24 317.968.8119
25 mbrown@k-glaw.com

26 ALSO PRESENT:

27 Mr. Mark Zaid

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	11		13
1 Q	And ultimately Mr. Bissonnette did sign that, correct?	1 Q	Are you reserving out something that my question
2 A	He signed this or something like it, yes.	2	includes when you give me that longer answer?
3 Q	Okay. And let me -- this is probably a good time to	3 A	There is differing opinions about whether some of the
4	add this, Mr. Podlaski. There are a lot of documents	4	assertions in the book are -- were classified, as your
5	in this case floating around, and sometimes there are	5	client testified to yesterday.
6	drafts of documents. I have what I think are	6 Q	All right. When did you first discover that there was
7	documents that are what they purport to be on their	7	any information in the book that other people would
8	face. If subsequent to the deposition you determine	8	consider classified?
9	that I have given you a document that is not what it	9 A	I'm pausing to answer that, because the August 30th
10	purports to be, if there is a page missing, or it was	10	letter from Jeh Johnson indicates the first formal
11	an earlier draft, if you will let your counsel know so	11	notice that anyone believed the materials in the book
12	he can let me know, because it is my intent to rely on	12	contained classified information.
13	these at trial as exhibits, but I don't want to do	13 Q	Prior to that letter, did you have any concern about
14	that if I've somehow, through copying, stuck a wrong	14	the book containing information in violation of
15	page in or something like that.	15	Mr. Bissonnette's obligations to the Government?
16	MR. FURMAN: I think what we can do is take it as	16 A	That's a pretty broad question.
17	it comes, because for us to give a blanket assurance	17 Q	Yes, sir.
18	at this point --	18 A	But specifically, as I told Mr. Bissonnette one of the
19	MR. JOHNSTON: I'm not asking a blanket assurance	19	first times I spoke with him, that based on my
20	of anything other than you'll let me know later if you	20	experience I could review material for tactics,
21	discover I don't have an accurate document.	21	techniques, procedures, technical devices or -- and/or
22	MR. FURMAN: Well, we'll do our best.	22	related to communications, but I don't know what I
23	MR. JOHNSTON: In fact -- well, I won't take the	23	don't know. And there's something called
24	time to do it now, but I will point up that Exhibit	24	"classification by compilation" that would enable
25	No. 3, which Mr. Furman marked yesterday in the	25	foreign agents, persons who are schooled in
	12		14
1	deposition, has as an attachment the same letter with	1	intelligence gathering, to be able to take what
2	the signature, and you can compare them later. I	2	appears to be innocuous information and piece it
3	simply didn't produce a signed one for purposes of	3	together, not only from his book but from other books
4	this deposition today.	4	or from open sources, and derive what would be
5	(Exhibit 34	5	operative -- excuse me -- would be operational
6	marked for identification.)	6	intelligence.
7	MR. JOHNSTON: And now let me mark as Exhibit 34	7	So as I told him from one of the first
8	what I believe to be a copy of all of the Carson	8	meetings -- or first telephone calls we had, "Your
9	Boxberger bills in this matter, and we will be	9	safest course is to submit the book for review,
10	referring to them. We'll ask for the same	10	because you don't know what you don't know. I don't
11	understanding. I'm not asking you to ratify here	11	know what I don't know."
12	today that that's every bill or that every bill is	12 Q	And in your Answers to Interrogatories, you indicated
13	accurate, but if there are some problems that come up	13	you had a telephone call -- the first telephone call
14	where you don't believe that's what they are, let me	14	with him, I believe, if I'm remembering correctly, on
15	know.	15	January 18?
16	MR. FURMAN: Will do.	16 A	That's what I recall as well.
17	BY MR. JOHNSTON:	17 Q	Is it your belief that this conversation took place in
18 Q	Mr. Podlaski, as you sit here today, is it your	18	that first phone call?
19	contention that there is classified or confidential	19 A	I think the first phone call we just generally talked
20	information contained in the published version of "No	20	about his military status, we talked about his
21	Easy Day"?	21	concerns for security, we talked about his wanting to
22 A	It's my opinion that the information contained within	22	maintain anonymity, we talked about his contract with
23	"No Easy Day" contains no classified information that	23	Dutton, and we talked about my background. That's
24	is of concern to the United States with regard to its	24	what I recall.
25	national security.	25 Q	So is it your belief then that this telephone call

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	15	
1	about compilation would have taken place in the second	
2	phone call that's referenced, which I believe you	
3	indicated was on January 25?	
4	A I believe so. I think the first phone call was	
5	between myself and Elyse Cheney and Matthew	
6	Bissonnette; and the second phone call was -- and that	
7	was on a land line, I'm pretty sure. And the second	
8	call was with Matt, and it was a cell phone call.	
9	Q Did you promise or represent to Mr. Bissonnette that	
10	you would review the book to ensure that it didn't	
11	contain classified or sensitive information?	
12	A No. I think the Engagement Letter says that I would	
13	review it to ensure his compliance with his	
14	obligations under the agreement that he might have	
15	signed with the US Government concerning classified or	
16	classifiable information.	
17	Q And did you perform that task to the best of your	
18	ability?	
19	A I believe that I did.	
20	Q And as you sit here today, do you believe that you	
21	failed to find anything in the book that should have	
22	been removed to ensure his compliance with agreements	
23	he signed?	
24	MR. FURMAN: Could I have that last question read	
25	back? I'm not sure I understood it.	
	17	
1	footnote as much as possible the factual assertions	
2	that he was making by citing public source	
3	information, and I went so far as to research that and	
4	provide that information, and there were some things	
5	that I just couldn't find in the public domain. I	
6	recall that the co-writer, Kevin Maurer, also he	
7	agreed and found other foot -- other information to	
8	footnote that I couldn't find. But that was flatly	
9	rejected by the publisher. Initially they wanted to	
10	just make those endnotes instead of footnotes, and	
11	then they decided further to just make it a list of	
12	references cited in the book.	
13	So to answer your question, I had concerns that	
14	there was information in the book that could be	
15	construed by the Government to be sensitive, if not	
16	classified. At whatever level, I don't know.	
17	Q Is it your belief that if the footnotes had been	
18	added, the Government would not have had those	
19	concerns?	
20	A I can't tell, and I have no way of knowing that; but	
21	based on my experience, it was something that assists	
22	the author in getting the book past review when you	
23	can cite a legitimate public source as the source of	
24	the information.	
25	Q But at the time you were making these changes, you	
	16	
1	(Court Reporter read back.)	
2	A Well, here's the point. In the Government's review	
3	process, they could review it, and they don't care if	
4	it's already in the public domain. If you're writing	
5	a book about information the Government is concerned	
6	about, they don't want you to confirm what may be in	
7	the public domain. But some things, such as what your	
8	client testified to yesterday even, the terminology	
9	"SEAL Team 6" is supposed to be sensitive, and yet	
10	it's so saturated the public domain that it is common	
11	parlance.	
12	So, I can't really answer your question without	
13	that footnote that whereas I believe that anything	
14	that's in the book is either not classified or has	
15	been so saturated in the public domain that it is no	
16	longer a -- I wouldn't say a threat, but it is of no	
17	longer of any concern to the Government about the	
18	topic.	
19	Q Okay. Did you ever tell Mr. Bissonnette, after you	
20	had completed your review, that there might still be	
21	this information in there that is already in the	
22	public domain and should not be a concern but the	
23	Government might still get upset over it?	
24	A Yeah. There were quite a few issues. I suggested to	
25	him, his literary agent, and the publisher that they	
	18	
1	already knew this book was not going to be reviewed,	
2	correct?	
3	A I would not say that I knew it was not going to be	
4	reviewed, because I had initial conversation with Matt	
5	about getting the book reviewed, and I told him my	
6	experiences with getting the book reviewed. I told	
7	him that the time for review could be anywhere from	
8	two weeks to two years or never come. I also told him	
9	that the book may be reviewed and come back as, "Do	
10	not publish." It could come back as "You must revise	
11	it." It could come back as "You must redact these	
12	things." And then your publisher has the opportunity	
13	to decide with you, as the author, whether to publish	
14	the redacted, blacked-out words and paragraphs or	
15	to -- and then put in a summary, a non-classified	
16	summary of what those redacted notes were about, or to	
17	rewrite the book so that it contained no redactions.	
18	And once I explained this to your client, he was	
19	adamant that he did not want to submit the book for	
20	review if it was going to take longer than he had been	
21	given by the publisher to get the book to them in	
22	publishable format. He said that --	
23	Q Let me stop you just for a second, because we want to	
24	put this in context.	
25	A Sure.	

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	19		21
1	MR. FURMAN: Did you finish your answer to the	1	exactly how long.
2	question?	2	Q Did you bill for that call?
3	THE WITNESS: No, I didn't but --	3	A I don't know if I did or not.
4	MR. FURMAN: Well, I think my client would like	4	Q If that phone call is not in your bill for June, would
5	to finish his answer, if it's possible.	5	that indicate to you that that call did not take place
6	MR. JOHNSTON: And he will be allowed to.	6	in June?
7	Q But my question is, are you talking about a January 25	7	A Not at all. I often times wouldn't bill a client for
8	telephone call when you had this discussion?	8	telephone conversations. If it was a matter that was
9	A There were a couple of different discussions. One was	9	necessary because the client made -- gave me direction
10	January 25, and then there was another once he got the	10	about something, then I would memorialize it and send
11	manuscript to me.	11	him a letter saying, "Hey, this is what we talked
12	The last thing I was going to say was that he	12	about."
13	wanted -- what he told me was that the book -- he had	13	But that was not the relationship I had with
14	to meet the deadline. They had already given him an	14	Matt. When Matt first came to me, he was very, very
15	advance, and this was -- I think this was probably	15	concerned about security. He and his literary agent,
16	close to June when I first -- when I got the	16	Elyse Cheney, were hyper-concerned about keeping his
17	manuscript, this conversation, and that there was no	17	name out of the public view, security for his family
18	way they could submit the book at that time because	18	and himself.
19	they needed to get the book published before the	19	Q Well, you weren't hesitant about emailing him or
20	competition; and the competition, according to him,	20	Ms. Cheney in connection with the discharge of your
21	from what I recall, was that he referenced "Zero Dark	21	services, were you?
22	30". The movie was to come out, and I believe at that	22	MR. FURMAN: Objection to the form of the
23	time he also mentioned that there were other members	23	question.
24	in the Command who were writing books, higher-ranking	24	MR. JOHNSTON: What's the objection?
25	officers.	25	MR. FURMAN: Well, you're assuming that there was
	20		22
1	Q And that conversation took place in June, as you	1	any hesitancy. That's -- I'm objecting to the form of
2	recall?	2	the question.
3	A I believe it was in June when I got the manuscript.	3	He can answer.
4	Q I don't see a reference to that conversation in the	4	Q You may answer.
5	Answers to Interrogatories that you swore to. Is	5	A I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?
6	there a reason why it isn't in there?	6	Can you read it back?
7	A It must have slipped my mind. I think I did recall in	7	MR. FURMAN: Also lacks foundation.
8	the Interrogatories -- I talked about some phone calls	8	The client can answer the question.
9	in February, but, yeah, there was definitely a phone	9	(Court Reporter read back.)
10	call in June -- at least one phone call, if not more.	10	A I think that my email with him was respectful of the
11	I think there were more than one in June.	11	anonymity that he wanted to convey. Also, we didn't
12	One of the phone calls was with Matt Bissonnette	12	discuss the materials that he was going to include in
13	and also Kevin Maurer when we were talking about the	13	the book in any emails or billing. So I don't think I
14	footnoted issues. But the conversation with regard to	14	would call it hesitancy, but I think I would call it
15	submitting the book, again, was just Matt and I. He	15	respecting what his wishes were.
16	called me, and he was getting cold feet about	16	Q It is a true statement, is it not, that you routinely
17	submitting the book -- about publishing the book	17	emailed Ms. Cheney about the discharge of your
18	without it being submitted.	18	services in accordance with your Engagement Letter?
19	Q Is that phone call reflected -- was that a long phone	19	A Yeah, I think you need to explain to me what you mean
20	call?	20	by the discharge of my services, because we emailed
21	A As I sit here today, I don't recall. 15 minutes	21	about the contract, we emailed about -- when the
22	maybe.	22	manuscript was going to get to me and how long I would
23	Q So all of that was discussed, you believe, in	23	have to review it. So I don't know specifically what
24	something approaching a 15-minute phone call?	24	you mean.
25	A 15, 20 minutes, something like that. I don't recall	25	Q Well, let me ask you to look there at Exhibit 33, the

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	23		25
1 Engagement Letter. 2 A Okay. 3 Q And I'll use the language of your Engagement Letter. 4 You emailed Ms. Cheney about you assisting 5 Mr. Bissonnette with legal issues that he might 6 encounter in contracting with Dutton, correct? 7 A Correct. 8 Q And you emailed him in connection with reviewing the 9 publishable manuscript of his career to ensure his 10 compliance with his obligations under any agreements 11 he may have signed with the US Government not to 12 release classified or classifiable information or 13 otherwise compromise the national security interests 14 of the United States, correct? 15 A That's correct. 16 Q And yet -- and you tell me if I am incorrect. In my 17 review of the file, I have found no email or letter 18 that references the discussion you say you had with 19 Mr. Bissonnette in June. Is there such a document 20 that I haven't seen? 21 A I don't know. 22 Q And it's not in your Interrogatory Answers, correct? 23 A I believe that's correct. 24 Q And it's not referenced in your bills to 25 Mr. Bissonnette?		1 that request? 2 A I do not know. 3 Q There was a second request and then a second 4 production by Mr. Shannon. Did you have any role in 5 that? 6 A No, I don't think that I did. What I recall is that 7 the information -- I gave Mr. Shannon what I had, and 8 he was dealing directly with Carson Boxberger for 9 their digital information. I know at some point that 10 Carson Boxberger had a senior attorney assigned to 11 oversee the production of the digital information to 12 make sure that everything was produced. There was a 13 list of -- and they asked me to review it, and I 14 did -- a list of search terms that they used, which 15 was very comprehensive, and then they -- that attorney 16 did some kind of certification of his search and 17 submitted that. 18 Q Was that at the first request or the second request, 19 or do you know? 20 A I don't know, but I believe it was the second request. 21 Q Okay. Do you know why that wasn't done in response to 22 the first request? 23 A I don't know. What I think was happening was that 24 Mr. Shannon had reached out to the Department of 25 Justice, and they said -- I think it had something to	
1 A I have not looked through all of my bills, but I'll -- 2 if that's what you're representing, then I guess that 3 must be true. 4 Q Let me ask you to -- well, let me move to another 5 subject here for a minute here, and we may be able to 6 discharge this quickly. We'll see. 7 Did you have any role in connection with my 8 request on behalf of Mr. Bissonnette for the 9 production of his attorney-client file? 10 A I did. I had the hard paper file, which did not have 11 that many documents in it, and I produced immediately 12 the paper file that I had, to then-attorney Robert 13 Shannon. 14 Q Let me ask you, how long was it before you produced 15 the file to Mr. Shannon that you had? 16 A Within 24 hours. 17 Q Okay. And I gather by your comments that you did not 18 have the digital file? 19 A No. 20 Q Okay. And that remained at Carson Boxberger? 21 A Correct. 22 Q Did Carson Boxberger also have a hard copy file, to 23 your knowledge? 24 A I do not believe they did. 25 Q Do you know when the file was produced to me after	24	1 do with copies of the manuscript that they said were 2 not -- you know, they believed them to be classified 3 and no one is to read them and words to that effect. 4 I'm just trying to recall what Mr. Shannon said to me. 5 But I think that was the only issue, really, was the 6 copies of the manuscript. 7 But then I know that the attorney from Carson 8 Boxberger was directly told by the Department of 9 Justice's Assistant US Attorney, Mr. Peak, that they 10 were to produce everything to them immediately, and 11 that's what they did. 12 Q They were to produce everything to -- 13 A -- the Department of Justice. 14 Q Okay. So is it your understanding that Carson 15 Boxberger produced the entire file to the Department 16 of Justice before it was produced to me, or as a part 17 of the production to me? 18 A I don't know the answer to that question. That's -- 19 Mr. Shannon would have to answer that question. I 20 believe that Carson Boxberger gave everything that 21 they had to Mr. Shannon, as I did, and then they went 22 back and they searched again for the Department of 23 Justice, per their directive, per their subpoena, and 24 produced everything they had again. 25 So I was really not involved directly, and I	26

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	27	
1	don't think Carson Boxberger was involved directly 2 with producing to your firm the documents, but my 3 understanding is on both occasions they produced 4 everything that they had; first to Mr. Shannon, and 5 then Mr. Shannon withdrew, and then it was produced 6 directly to the Department of Justice, if memory 7 serves me correctly.	
8	Q Is it your -- first off, let me have the name of the 9 attorney who certified it, certified the search 10 results.	
11	A Calvert Miller.	
12	Q First name is spelled --	
13	A -- Calvert, C-a-l-v-e-r-t, Miller. He's a partner 14 there.	
15	Q Thank you, sir. Is it your testimony that Carson 16 Boxberger received a subpoena from the Department of 17 Justice for the file at or about the same time I 18 requested it?	
19	A I don't know the answer to that question.	
20	Q So you don't know the chronology of those events?	
21	A I do not.	
22	Q All right. There -- I understand that if I ask you 23 questions about what you told the Department of 24 Justice -- let me ask this.	
25	How many times were you interviewed by the	
	28	
1	Department of Justice in connection with 2 Mr. Bissonnette?	
3	A Once in person and once on the phone.	
4	Q Okay.	
5	A And in that order.	
6	Q Okay. And on the occasion you were interviewed in 7 person, you were represented by counsel at the 8 meeting?	
9	A Correct.	
10	Q And that counsel was who?	
11	A Jim Lassart.	
12	Q And when the telephone conversation took place, was 13 Mr. Lassart on the phone with you?	
14	A Yes.	
15	Q Okay. Can you tell me how long after the in-person 16 meeting the phone call was?	
17	A I think the in-person was in December of 2015 -- no, 18 '14, I think, and the phone call was six, seven months 19 later.	
20	Q Okay.	
21	A Maybe less.	
22	Q And I understand if I ask you -- you're aware that the 23 Court has ordered you to tell me what you told them, 24 correct?	
25	A I understand that, but we have requested relief --	
	29	
1	Q Let me continue. I'll take this --	
2	A You asked me the question, so I'm trying to answer.	
3	Q You understand that the Court has ordered you to tell 4 me what you told them, number one, correct?	
5	A Yes.	
6	Q And you have filed a Motion for Reconsideration, which 7 is still pending?	
8	A That's correct.	
9	Q And if I ask you what you told them, you're going to 10 stand on the Motion for Reconsideration and wait for 11 the Judge's ruling?	
12	A Yes, sir.	
13	Q Okay. And if I ask you what documents you gave them, 14 would you likewise not tell me and stand on the Motion 15 for Reconsideration?	
16	MR. FURMAN: I think we -- Mr. Podlaski already 17 testified his understanding is that the firm produced 18 the entire file to the Government. I don't know that 19 that's -- there's anything more beyond that.	
20	MR. JOHNSTON: Right now I'm speaking only about 21 him, not the firm.	
22	MR. FURMAN: All right. That's fair.	
23	Q Let me ask you this. Did you individually, at your 24 meeting or via some other transmission, give documents 25 to the Department of Justice?	
	30	
1	A They received -- the documents that I had in the hard 2 file we put on pdf and those were given to 3 Mr. Shannon. Those same documents were given to the 4 Department of Justice, no more, no less.	
5	Q By Mr. Shannon?	
6	A Which?	
7	Q I'm sorry. That's fair confusion. I apologize. 8 When you say those documents that you had in a 9 hard copy were given to Mr. Shannon --	
10	A -- in pdf form.	
11	Q -- in pdf form, is it your testimony that Mr. Shannon 12 then gave them to the Department of Justice?	
13	A I don't know.	
14	Q You just know that the Department of Justice got them 15 somehow?	
16	A No, I know that the Department of Justice asked me for 17 them specifically. They wanted a copy of my hard 18 file, and I sent them the same pdf, because it was 19 a --	
20	Q Okay.	
21	A Let me finish, please. Because it was a complete pdf 22 of the hard copies that I had, and I sent it to them. 23 I also had to fill out an affidavit saying that I 24 gave them everything I had.	
25	Q All right. Now I think I understand. So you gave	

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

1 your more limited, small file to Mr. Shannon 2 immediately after my request? 3 A Yes, sir. 4 Q And sometime thereafter, you likewise gave that same 5 file to the Department of Justice? 6 A Right. And I did it through -- I say I directly gave 7 it to them. Well, I did it with my attorney, Jim 8 Lassart. 9 Q Okay. Do you recall whether you delivered that at 10 your meeting or whether it was sent in advance of your 11 meeting? 12 A It was sent in advance. 13 Q All right. And you still have a record of whatever 14 you sent, I assume. 15 A I have the pdf and the hard copy, yes. 16 Q Okay. If -- well, do you know from your personal 17 experience what Carson Boxberger gave the Department 18 of Justice, separate and apart from your file? Just 19 yes or no? 20 A Well, I can't answer that. 21 Q Okay. 22 A I know that they gave them documents. I believe they 23 gave me a CD of the -- a CD copy of what they gave, 24 but I don't know all the documents that are in there. 25 Q Okay. Do you know whether Carson Boxberger gave the	31 1 A This last page appears to be not connected to -- 2 KP02192 doesn't appear to be connected. 3 Q I don't even have that page. May I see what you have 4 sir? 5 A Sure. 6 Q We may have stapled a page that doesn't belong on the 7 document. 8 (Pause) 9 Q No, you are correct. That one doesn't belong there. 10 That's a different document. 11 MR. FURMAN: So we are taking out the one ending 12 in 92? 13 MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, sir. 14 Q So do you now have a three-page document? 15 A I do. 16 Q And the first page says "MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD" and it 17 has Paragraphs 1 through 8? 18 A Right. 19 Q With a Bates number of 116 at the bottom? 20 A Correct. 21 Q And then second page is Bates numbered 117 and has 22 Paragraphs 9 and 10? 23 A Correct. 24 Q And then page 3 has Bates number 340 on it. 25 A Correct.
32 1 Department of Justice any documents that it did not 2 produce through Mr. Shannon to me? 3 A I do not know to certainty, but from my conversations 4 with both Attorney Miller and Attorney Pape, I believe 5 that they gave the same documents but with the caveat 6 that there was a search done by Calvert Miller with 7 search terms that were very broad in the second 8 production. So -- 9 Q Do you know how many productions Carson Boxberger gave 10 to the Department of Justice? 11 A I believe just one. 12 Q Okay. Let me ask you to look at a document. 13 (Exhibit 35 14 marked for identification.) 15 Q Let me ask you to look at a document marked 35 that at 16 the top is entitled in all capital letters "MEMORANDUM 17 FOR RECORD". Are you the author of this document? 18 A Just one moment. 19 Q Certainly. 20 (Pause) 21 A Yes, it appears to be the memorandum that I prepared. 22 Q Now, I didn't bring it, but I will tell you I have 23 more than one version of this document where dates 24 changed. Do I have both copies there? Oh, yes, 25 there's at least a second page 1 attached.	32 34 1 Q And let me just ask you to compare the third page and 2 the first page, because they are not identical with 3 regard to dates. Do you know why there would be two 4 versions of this memorandum with the different dates? 5 A Yeah. I think, first off, I created one of them and 6 then I couldn't find it, and then created the other 7 one. So -- but why there would be different dates? 8 One of them I wrote earlier, like in the spring of 9 2012; and then the other one I wrote later, I think in 10 July of 2012, July or August. 11 Q Which one did you write in the spring of 2012? 12 A I think the 340. 13 Q Okay. And is it your belief that the 340 document 14 ends with Paragraph 8? 15 A I don't recall. 16 Q Because I -- if you look at the last sentence, I think 17 I may have left off a second page of it. 18 A Yeah, I don't recall. 19 Q Okay. 20 A You're right. It seems like there's more. 21 Q And if there is more to the document numbered 348 22 (sic) that matches the second page -- 23 MR. FURMAN: You mean 340. 24 Q Yes, sir. Thank you for that correction. If there is 25 more to 348 (sic) that matches in substance what is

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: right;">35</p> <p>1 numbered 117, would you agree with me that you did not 2 draft 340 in the spring of 2012, because it references 3 events occurring in June?</p> <p>4 A Yeah, that's a fair estimation. Yeah, also if you 5 look at 340, it's internally inconsistent. So I think 6 I roughed one of these out, because it says "February" 7 in Paragraph 1, and in Paragraph 2 it says "January". 8 But in any event --</p> <p>9 MR. FURMAN: I just want to make sure I heard it 10 and the record is clear. You say "roughed it out"?</p> <p>11 A Yeah. I mean, I just -- I think it was this 340 that 12 I kind of threw together based on -- I have a pad next 13 to my phone and I scribble down things, and then I 14 would, you know, typed it up and threw the notes away. 15 But I don't recall.</p> <p>16 Q Can we agree then that with regard to the documents, 17 they were done after June of 2012?</p> <p>18 A I wouldn't agree that both of them were done after 19 June of 2012. I don't know. I don't recall.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Why did you do this memorandum?</p> <p>21 A Just my habit of recording issues or recording events 22 either for my memory or for -- just because -- I think 23 in this case it was because Mark -- or Matt -- had 24 said from the very beginning how he wanted to maintain 25 anonymity, and I didn't include things in billing</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">37</p> <p>1 (Exhibit 36 2 marked for identification.)</p> <p>3 Q Let me just ask you to look in the chain there. 4 There's -- the second email down on page 1 is an email 5 from you to Elyse Cheney, correct?</p> <p>6 A Okay. Where are you referring to? At the top?</p> <p>7 Q Right here, sir (indicating).</p> <p>8 A Okay. All right.</p> <p>9 Q Dated January 17; do you see that?</p> <p>10 A Yeah.</p> <p>11 Q The final sentence there is, "Did Mark sign an 12 Engagement Letter with Rich's firm?" 13 Does that refresh your memory as to whether you 14 knew Rich Heller was representing him?</p> <p>15 A No. Can I please read this? Because I don't recall 16 this document. 17 (Pause)</p> <p>18 A This 2417 doesn't appear to be a complete document, 19 because it just -- she's referring to, "How should we 20 sign this?" 21 I don't know what this is referencing, because it 22 doesn't provide any background.</p> <p>23 Q Well, isn't the subject of Ms. Cheney's email to you 24 "Retainer Agreement"?</p> <p>25 A That's true.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">36</p> <p>1 statements because of that. So I wanted to just have 2 an internal record.</p> <p>3 Q Did you -- is it possible that you did this after Jeh 4 Johnson's letter?</p> <p>5 A I don't recall that. So no, I don't think it was. I 6 think it was in July or early August. 7 I don't know as I sit here, but I don't believe 8 so.</p> <p>9 Q During 2012, you knew Mr. Bissonnette had attorneys 10 representing him other than you, correct?</p> <p>11 A When?</p> <p>12 Q From the moment you first began representing him.</p> <p>13 A No, I didn't know he had any other attorneys 14 representing him on anything until August 30th when 15 Robert Luskin called me up and said that he was 16 recently hired by Matthew Bissonnette and that I was 17 to have no further communication with his client 18 except if he was present.</p> <p>19 Q So you didn't know he was represented by Mr. Heller?</p> <p>20 A No idea.</p> <p>21 Q So when there are emails -- if there are emails from 22 you confirming Mr. Heller's representation, you 23 wouldn't be able to explain that today?</p> <p>24 A I don't recall that.</p> <p>25 Q Let me show you what we'll mark as Exhibit 36.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">38</p> <p>1 Q And then it says, "How should we sign this? Mark's 2 wife could sign it or else I could."</p> <p>3 A That's true, but it doesn't necessarily answer the 4 whether or not there's -- there were other 5 information -- there were other emails exchanged on 6 this topic.</p> <p>7 Q I'm sure there were others, but then you replied to 8 that moments later and said, "Can't have his wife or 9 you sign." And then you cite Rules of Professional 10 Responsibility, correct?</p> <p>11 A Nonetheless -- yes, that's correct. But nonetheless, 12 it doesn't mean that there wasn't previous emails 13 exchanged on the topic.</p> <p>14 Q And then there's an email from Elyse back to you, same 15 date. "I was thinking if I signed it I could be the 16 client, but I guess that would mean you couldn't set 17 up two LLC's."</p> <p>18 And then you reply to that as well.</p> <p>19 A Okay. I still haven't finished reviewing it, and you 20 asked me a question; so if I could finish reviewing 21 it, then I'll be able to answer your question. 22 (Pause)</p> <p>23 A Okay. Having read this document, in answer to your 24 previous question, I believe that at the time, I was 25 aware that he had -- according to what Elyse Cheney</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

39	41
<p>1 said, he, being Matt Bissonnette, had an Engagement 2 Letter with Mr. Heller for -- as an entertainment 3 lawyer, but I didn't have any other interface with him 4 that I know of.</p> <p>5 Q And my question was, so in 2012 from the moment you 6 began representing him, you knew he had other lawyers 7 representing him also, correct?</p> <p>8 A I knew apparently that he had signed an Engagement 9 Letter with Richard Heller.</p> <p>10 Q And is it your testimony here today that that's all 11 you knew about Mr. Heller?</p> <p>12 A As far as I recall, yes; and then in August 30th, I 13 knew that he had retained Mr. Luskin.</p> <p>14 Q Did you have any communications with Mr. Heller?</p> <p>15 A Not that I recall. I'm sorry to interrupt you.</p> <p>16 Q That's all right.</p> <p>17 When do you contend that your representation of 18 Mr. Bissonnette ended?</p> <p>19 A When Mr. Luskin said, "Don't have any further contact 20 with my client without my being present."</p> <p>21 Q And when was that?</p> <p>22 A I believe it was on or before August 30th, 2012.</p> <p>23 Q Do you know from the documents we've produced when 24 Mr. Luskin was retained?</p> <p>25 A No, I do not.</p>	<p>1 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, go ahead.</p> <p>2 MR. FURMAN: There were two questions, and I 3 wasn't sure which one you want my client to answer.</p> <p>4 Q The question is is there some reason you are 5 highlighting the fact that the discussions were email 6 discussions?</p> <p>7 A No, just other than the fact that they were group 8 exchanges.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. So is it your testimony then that the only 10 contact you would have had with Mr. Bissonnette after 11 the telephone call with Mr. Luskin was either group 12 email exchanges or matters unrelated to the book?</p> <p>13 A I believe that to be true, yes.</p> <p>14 Q In the group email exchanges, was Mr. Luskin involved?</p> <p>15 A I don't recall if on every email exchange he was, but 16 I believe that he was.</p> <p>17 Q Did he ever in -- did he ever complain to you about 18 the fact that you were continuing to have contact with 19 Mr. Bissonnette contrary to his directions to you of 20 August 30 or before?</p> <p>21 A No, because I didn't give him any reason to complain.</p> <p>22 Q Did you bill for any of your work after this phone 23 call?</p> <p>24 A I don't recall as I sit here, but I suspect I did. I 25 did some work at the direction of Mr. Luskin.</p>
40	42
<p>1 Q Did you continue to have conversations with 2 Mr. Bissonnette, notwithstanding these directions from 3 Mr. Luskin?</p> <p>4 A I think the conversations might have been through 5 email with other persons being present; and if they 6 weren't, they were likely on matters that were not 7 directly related to the issues concerning the book 8 review by the Department of Defense.</p> <p>9 Q Mr. Podlaski, did you, after your conversation with 10 Mr. Luskin, have discussions with Mr. Bissonnette 11 about your -- the book and your representation of him?</p> <p>12 A I already answered your question.</p> <p>13 Q Is the answer then yes, you did?</p> <p>14 A No. You're mischaracterizing my answer. What I said 15 was if I did, I had discussions with him through email 16 channels or email exchanges, or they were matters that 17 were not related directly to the DoD's issues with the 18 book, that I recall.</p> <p>19 Q When you make a point of saying you had email 20 discussions with him, are you suggesting that 21 Mr. Luskin -- Mr. Luskin's directions to you permitted 22 you to have email discussions or -- I'm not sure why 23 you're saying "I had email discussions."</p> <p>24 A Well, it was group discussions.</p> <p>25 MR. FURMAN: Objection.</p>	<p>1 Q Would that be an indication that your representation 2 hadn't ended, if you continued to work and bill for 3 your work at the request of Mr. Luskin?</p> <p>4 A I believe that I was assisting, but I was -- no longer 5 had a direct one-on-one relationship with 6 Mr. Bissonnette, and I was assisting Mr. Luskin in his 7 primary representation of Mr. Bissonnette.</p> <p>8 Q And in what capacity were you assisting Mr. Luskin?</p> <p>9 A Well, I assisted Mr. Luskin with regard to matters 10 concerning process and handling of classified 11 information.</p> <p>12 Q As an attorney for Mr. Bissonnette?</p> <p>13 A Yeah. He was the only one who I had an Engagement 14 Letter with.</p> <p>15 MR. FURMAN: Randy, could we take a very quick 16 break?</p> <p>17 MR. JOHNSTON: Certainly. (Recess)</p> <p>18 BY MR. JOHNSTON:</p> <p>19 Q Mr. Podlaski, did you ever tell Mr. Bissonnette that 20 you were not his attorney?</p> <p>21 A No, I don't believe so.</p> <p>22 Q Did you ever tell him that he could not or should not 23 rely on your advice?</p> <p>24 A No, I did not.</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	43		45
1	Q Did you send Freedom of Information Act requests for	1	A Well, Mr. Luskin asked me to do so as well, and if you
2	Mr. Bissonnette in September and November of 2012?	2	look at the Engagement Letter, I was just -- as far as
3	A I believe September. I don't recall sending any in	3	I was concerned, my obligations under the Engagement
4	November, but I believe it was September; yes, I did.	4	Letter had been met. And so I reviewed the
5	Q And did you in May of 2013 report on the status of	5	publication, I helped with the contract. So at this
6	those requests to Mr. Bissonnette and to an individual	6	point, I was rendering assistance, and Mr. Luskin
7	employed in Elyse Cheney's office?	7	asked me to do certain things, and I did them.
8	A Well, I recall that an individual from Elyse Cheney's	8	Q And is that the reason you sent the Freedom of
9	office called me up, which I thought very odd since I	9	Information Act requests in November of 2012?
10	had not heard from anyone in months. I was believing	10	A I'm not sure that I sent one in 2012, as I said
11	our relationship had died on the vine. So believing	11	previously.
12	that I may have still had an obligation to close the	12	Q You did say that.
13	loop on that, I think I provided whatever the status	13	A If I did, then yeah. I didn't do it out of any
14	was to Mr. Jacobs, I believe his name was.	14	prurient interest.
15	Q Yes, that's correct. In connection with that, did you	15	Q So if you did, you did it to benefit Mr. Bissonnette?
16	also have a telephone or email exchange with	16	A Indirectly you could say that, but I was assisting
17	Mr. Bissonnette personally about it?	17	Mr. Luskin in -- by doing what he asked me to do.
18	A You know, I don't recall.	18	Q Whose idea was it to send Freedom of Information Act
19	Q At any point in time, did you have any concern about	19	requests?
20	communicating with Mr. Bissonnette because he was	20	A I think it was actually my idea when we had a group
21	represented by other counsel on this matter?	21	telephone call, either -- sometime early September.
22	A Yeah, after August 30th, 2012, as I already said.	22	And someone had raised the question of why are they
23	Q So did you hesitate to communicate with him after that	23	doing this, why are they singling us out, and in my
24	point in time?	24	experience, there were authors who had not submitted
25	A I did not communicate with him directly, one-on-one	25	their books for review and there was not -- in other
	44		46
1	after that time, because I was told not to by	1	words, there was precedence for not submitting your
2	Mr. Luskin, who clearly now was the primary counsel on	2	book for review, and if you wanted to use that as part
3	handling matters related to the book. I had complied	3	of your contention with the Government, that's what
4	essentially with what I was required to do under the	4	Mr. Luskin wanted to do.
5	Engagement Letter and was, in my mind, being kept on	5	Q Did Mr. Luskin in this phone call on August 30 or
6	to assist just because of the knowledge that I had and	6	before that you earlier referenced tell you that the
7	experience with regard to classified information	7	attorney-client relationship with Mr. Bissonnette was
8	processing.	8	being terminated?
9	Q Did Mr. Bissonnette ever tell you that he was	9	A I think he did in so many words, as I explained
10	terminating the attorney-client relationship with you?	10	previously.
11	A No, I don't believe he did.	11	Q I'm not interested for the moment in so many words.
12	Q Did you ever tell him you were terminating the	12	Did he say, in effect, "Your relationship" -- "Your
13	relationship with him?	13	attorney-client relationship with Mr. Bissonnette is
14	A No, I don't believe that I did.	14	hereby terminated"?
15	Q Would it be reasonable for Mr. Bissonnette to believe	15	A No, he didn't say those words, but that was the
16	you continued to represent him in November of 2012 if	16	message I got.
17	in November of 2012 you, in fact, did send Freedom of	17	Q Did he say, "You are not to talk to Mr. Bissonnette"?
18	Information Act requests on his behalf?	18	A He said, "Don't talk to him unless I am present."
19	MR. FURMAN: Objection.	19	Q Okay.
20	You can answer.	20	A Meaning that he was involved in a telephone
21	A I would be speculating.	21	conversation. We had never had a face-to-face
22	Q Can you think of any reason you would have sent	22	meeting, any of us, so I knew he couldn't be referring
23	Freedom of Information Act requests related to other	23	to that.
24	authors and their pre-publication review status, other	24	Q Do you agree with me that it is entirely possible to
25	than to be of assistance to Mr. Bissonnette?	25	have a continuing attorney-client relationship with

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	47	
1	Mr. Bissonnette even though Mr. Luskin wants to be 2 present on every phone call you have with him?	
3	MR. FURMAN: Objection.	
4	A You're asking me to answer a hypothetical and 5 speculate.	
6	Q Are you able to answer that question whether or not 7 it's possible to have -- for you to have an ongoing 8 attorney-client relationship with Mr. Bissonnette 9 notwithstanding Mr. Luskin's directions to you that he 10 wanted to be a part of any conversations you had with 11 him?	
12	MR. FURMAN: Objection.	
13	A You're still asking me to speculate. Based on what 14 Mr. Luskin told me, I believe that I was effectively 15 fired as Mr. Bissonnette's primary counsel and was 16 only being asked to assist Mr. Luskin in his 17 responding to Department of Defense.	
18	Q But being fired as primary counsel is not the same as 19 being fired as counsel, is it? It's a demotion.	
20	A If that's what you want to contend, fine, but that's 21 your opinion.	
22	Q In connection with Mr. -- the billing of 23 Mr. Bissonnette, did you write off any time?	
24	A I did.	
25	Q Are there records at Carson Boxberger that would	
	48	
1	reflect time that was written off?	
2	A I don't know. I know that I had submitted a bill to 3 Elyse Cheney, and then she nickel and dimed it, and I 4 revised it, but I think that was only in the very 5 beginning.	
6	Q Let me put that aside. I know what you're talking 7 about there. I'm talking about you unilaterally 8 recording time, and then at the time the bill is 9 prepared, deciding "I'm not going to bill that."	
10	A Oh, I misunderstood your question.	
11	Q That's my fault.	
12	A No, I just didn't write down the time -- like 13 telephone calls and things of that nature I didn't 14 write down. Like I said, Mr. Bissonnette wanted to be 15 circumspect about things that were recorded and 16 written down, and I did not write down all of my time.	
17	Q Did Mr. Bissonnette at any point act contrary to your 18 advice?	
19	A What do you mean?	
20	Q Have you ever handled any -- you may not have, 21 Mr. Podlaski -- any medical malpractice cases in your 22 professional career?	
23	A No, I'm not a medical malpractice attorney.	
24	Q Okay. Here's what I'm getting at, if you'll allow me 25 to explain it. Doctors routinely have what they call	
	49	
1	an AMA memo or entry "Against Medical Advice". They 2 tell the patient, "You need this surgery;" the patient 3 says, "I don't want it." "You need chemo;" "I'm not 4 going to take chemo." "You need to take a pill every 5 day;" "I'm not going to take a pill every day." And 6 they make an entry, "Patient is acting against medical 7 advice."	
8	I'm asking kind of within that kind of concept in 9 a legal framework. Did Mr. Bissonnette ever act 10 against your legal advice?	
11	MR. FURMAN: Objection.	
12	A I would say no. What we did was he asked me for 13 advice on matters. I presented to him the options. I 14 presented to him the ramifications for each of the 15 courses of action, and he made a decision.	
16	And specifically what I'm referring to is when we 17 first had a telephone conversation, he asked about 18 submitting -- whether the book had to be submitted and 19 the process involved with submitting, and I explained 20 that to him. And then we went over Standard Form 312 21 and my interpretation of that. In particular, 22 Paragraph 3 of it says if you're uncertain as to 23 whether or not your writing or public speech contains 24 classified information, then you should check with the 25 agency; as opposed to the DD Form 1847-1, which	
	50	
1	unequivocally requires one to submit the document to 2 review if it is in any way, shape, or form derived 3 from a Special Access Program. And I also explained 4 to him the ramifications of those decisions.	
5	"You could do anything -- you could be subjected 6 to anything from forfeiture, to criminal prosecution, 7 and that could be under either of those forms." Never 8 represented to him that the Government had the same 9 position I did with regard to 312, although the 10 document speaks for itself about whether you have a 11 question or not. So it seems to be some discretion.	
12	Mr. Bissonnette's concern was not going to jail. 13 That's what he constantly during our conversation -- I 14 don't mean constantly -- well, he said it a couple of 15 times. I don't want to be too hyperbolic on it, but 16 he said a couple times, "I just don't want to go to 17 jail here." So I had researched and reviewed through 18 ECF and -- the Electronic Filing System -- and also 19 researched some case law and found that the military 20 had not prosecuted anyone criminally for writing a 21 book that was marginally violative of the Classified 22 Information Non-disclosure Agreement, but certainly 23 had done many forfeitures. And Mr. Bissonnette's 24 response was didn't really care about the money, was 25 going to donate it to charity, he just didn't want to	

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	51		53
1 go to jail. 2 Q Object to everything after "I would say no" as 3 nonresponsive. 4 If he had acted contrary to your advice, would it 5 have been your practice to have put something either 6 in your file or sent him an indication to memorialize 7 that? 8 A You're asking me to speculate on something that didn't 9 happen. 10 Q Let me rephrase it then. 11 Is it your practice as a lawyer to memorialize 12 occasions when clients act contrary to your advice or 13 not in their own best interests in your opinion? 14 A It depends on whether it was a major decision or not. 15 If it was a minor issue, I might make a 16 memorandum for record for myself. If it was a major 17 issue, it might be a client relationship ending issue, 18 so I would terminate the relationship. 19 And sometimes there's decisions that are neither 20 severe nor minor, that it's entirely within the 21 purview of the client to make a decision and the 22 decision is theirs, and it's -- often times we'll call 23 it a business decision about what they want to do. 24 Q I find in your file no memo or letter or email or 25 other communication to Mr. Bissonnette that outlines	1 that or not is not something for this witness to 2 answer. It's really subject to the Court's discretion 3 if we make that application to do so. So I don't know 4 that Mr. Podlaski would be in a position to comment on 5 that. He's a party, a witness, and that decision, 6 whether we contemplate it or not, is for the lawyers 7 and ultimately for the Court's approval. 8 MR. JOHNSTON: And if he's going to testify as an 9 expert witness, then I'm permitted to ask about his 10 qualifications, and I'm not -- I recognize he may not 11 have his opinions formalized. If he anticipates 12 testifying as an expert, I want to know it. 13 MR. FURMAN: Under the Court's order as I 14 understand it, the time to name experts hasn't -- 15 MR. JOHNSTON: The deadline has not passed. 16 MR. FURMAN: -- has not passed. 17 MR. JOHNSTON: But it's not a Court order that 18 says you must disclose them no earlier than this date. 19 You can disclose them later. 20 My question is, sitting here today, does the 21 witness have an expectation that he will testify as an 22 expert? 23 MR. FURMAN: I don't think we know one way or the 24 other. 25 MR. JOHNSTON: He has an expectation. You may	54	
1 the options and the risks associated with publishing 2 the book without a Governmental review. Is there such 3 a document in existence that I haven't seen? 4 MR. FURMAN: Objection. 5 You can answer. 6 THE WITNESS: No, no. 7 MR. FURMAN: I just placed an objection, because 8 I'm not sure that the way the question is posed, it's 9 referring to Mr. Johnston's -- his -- I'm trying to 10 find the right word -- representation of what's 11 contained in the file. 12 With that objection, you can answer. 13 THE WITNESS: I'm really sorry. Can you repeat 14 the question, after that long-winded objection? 15 (Court Reporter read back.) 16 A I don't believe so. 17 Q Is it your expectation at the trial of this case to 18 testify as an expert witness on anything? 19 MR. FURMAN: Objection. 20 A Not at the present time. 21 Q Okay. And to be clear with you, do you anticipate 22 testifying as to the standard of care for lawyers who 23 represent authors with confidentiality obligations 24 growing out of Government services of some type? 25 MR. FURMAN: Objection. Whether we decide to do	1 not, but he does. 2 MR. FURMAN: I don't know his answer to that 3 question, but -- 4 MR. JOHNSTON: We never will know it if you and I 5 both don't stop talking. 6 A Not at the present time. 7 Q Do you agree with me that your duty as attorney for 8 Mr. Bissonnette included the duty to advise him on 9 whether he had a pre-publication review obligation? 10 A Yes. 11 Q Did you advise him that he had no such obligation? 12 A I advised him that by explaining what the forms 13 required, by explaining the type of information that 14 he was exposed to. You sign a document -- normally, 15 the correct way to do it, you sign a document that 16 would be associated with the level of the information 17 that's provided. 18 So, if you're on a mission that is not a 19 compartmented or Special Access Program, the Standard 20 Form 312 that you sign when you come into Special 21 Operations would cover that. And then the issue in 22 Paragraph 3 is whether or not you have a question or 23 you are uncertain as to whether information is 24 classified or not. 25 So, my answer is the documents and the	54	

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p>1 information that you are exposed to drive your 2 obligation.</p> <p>3 Q So did you advise him he did have an obligation; did 4 you advise him he did not have an obligation; did you 5 advise him you didn't know if he did or did not?</p> <p>6 A I advised him, as I just explained, about the 7 requirements and explained to him that Standard Form 8 312 appears to be discretionary in that it says if you 9 are uncertain that the information you're going to use 10 is classified. Mr. Bissonnette had no uncertainty, 11 and he also told me that he did not recall signing any 12 Special Access Program documents, and he did not 13 recall receiving a briefing telling him that the 14 information in connection with Operation Neptune Spear 15 was a Special Access or compartmented program.</p> <p>16 So based upon that, the only document that he 17 recalled signing was Standard Form 312, and then it 18 was at his discretion and his decision as to whether 19 or not he had an obligation.</p> <p>20 Q Did you recommend that he not submit the book to a 21 pre-publication review?</p> <p>22 A I explained to you just now what our conversation 23 consisted of, and it was his decision to make.</p> <p>24 Q Of course it's his decision. My question is did you 25 recommend that he not submit to a pre-publication</p>	<p>55</p> <p>1 in the middle of page 1 --</p> <p>2 A Um-hum.</p> <p>3 Q -- of the document. And down in the last paragraph of 4 your email to Mr. Luskin on which you copied 5 Mr. Owen -- well, just read that paragraph for me, 6 please.</p> <p>7 A This is the one that's dated September 20th, 2012?</p> <p>8 Q Yes, sir.</p> <p>9 A So this was after the book was written.</p> <p>10 Q Yes, sir. And after Mr. Luskin's telephone call with 11 you that you discussed earlier.</p> <p>12 A Right. And so you see this is to Mr. Luskin and copy 13 furnished to Mark Owen.</p> <p>14 Q And read the last paragraph aloud, please.</p> <p>15 A Okay. "Having been in Special Operations over 12 16 years, Mark was very confident that he was not going 17 to address or describe any classified or classifiable 18 information in the manuscript, and with my 19 recommendation, Mark decided not to send the 20 manuscript to USSOCOM or Office of Security Policy 21 Review, OSPR".</p> <p>22 Q Does that refresh your recollection as to whether or 23 not you recommended he not send the manuscript for 24 review?</p> <p>25 A There's a comma after the word "recommendation". My</p>
<p>1 review?</p> <p>2 A I don't think it was that simple. It was more of, 3 "The best thing to do is to submit the book and then 4 you have no worries," but he was driven by a timeline 5 and -- apparently imposed by his publisher, and so he 6 said that he could not submit the book -- and as a 7 matter of fact, I had even tried to revisit the issue 8 with him and his literary agent by proposing language 9 to change the contract with Dutton, and they both 10 struck that proposed paragraph and said they didn't 11 have time for the publisher -- excuse me -- they 12 didn't have time for the review of the publication.</p> <p>13 So the recommendation I made was, "Submit the 14 book," and the decision was his to make. And then 15 once he made the decision, said that "It's a plausible 16 way to go based upon what you're telling me; that is, 17 that you only signed the 312, you didn't sign any 18 Special Access Program documents and you were not 19 exposed to any Special Access Programs."</p> <p>20 (Exhibit 37</p> <p>21 marked for identification.)</p> <p>22 Q Let me show you what I have marked as Exhibit 37, 23 which appears to be an email exchange between you and 24 Mr. Luskin, and I am going to direct your attention 25 specifically to the email from you to Mr. Luskin here</p>	<p>56</p> <p>1 recommendation was as I explained it to you. I showed 2 him the options, explained to him what the 3 ramifications were of either submitting the book and 4 suffering either the delay, do not publish 5 recommendation for -- order from the Department of 6 Defense, or not submitting the book and the potential 7 consequences.</p> <p>8 So, that is not necessarily, as you put it, my 9 recommendation was not to submit the book. Mark 10 decided not to submit the manuscript. My 11 recommendation was as I explained to you. I told him 12 what the options were, and it was his decision.</p> <p>13 Q So is it your testimony today that when you wrote this 14 email to Mr. Luskin with a copy to your client, 15 Mr. Owen, and said, "With my recommendation, Mark 16 decided not to submit the manuscript," you did not 17 intend to say that his decision was consistent with 18 your recommendation?</p> <p>19 A When I said "and with my recommendation," comma, "Mark 20 decided not to send the manuscript to USSOCOM or 21 OSPR." My recommendation was, as I said, an analysis 22 of what the ramifications were for not submitting it 23 and the potential penalties that he would suffer and, 24 as well, a decision by him about whether the book 25 contained classified information or not. I certainly</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

59	61
60	62

1 assisted him with helping to glean the book from
2 classified information, but as I said, I don't know
3 what I don't know, explained that to him, and told him
4 it was his decision. And it was a business decision.

5 Q So did you make -- and I understand you keep --
6 respectfully, you keep wanting to tell me the basis of
7 what you told him, the things he should consider. But
8 then in the end, after considering all of that and
9 after you analyzing it, did you make a recommendation,
10 "I recommend you submit it," "I recommend you not
11 submit it," or did you simply, in the alternative,
12 download the information and leave it entirely up to
13 him?

14 A Based on what he told me, that he had only signed a
15 special -- a Standard Form 312, that he was out of the
16 Navy as of February 1st, that he had no further
17 obligation to the military, that he was -- did not
18 receive Special Access Program information on
19 Operation Neptune Spear, that he did not sign any DD
20 Form 1847-1, knowing what I knew, part of our -- and
21 after reviewing with him the ramifications of the
22 decisions -- the decision that was his to make, as I
23 said, after he made the decision, I believe that to be
24 a perfectly plausible decision, knowing what I knew at
25 the time.

1 Q Are you able to tell me whether you recommended a
2 review or recommended against a review to your client,
3 who was relying on you to make this -- to help him
4 make this decision?

5 A Oh, I definitely --

6 MR. FURMAN: Objection, just the last part of
7 that question. You added the reference that the
8 client was relying, and I think that that's the part
9 of the question I'm objecting to.

10 A As I said earlier, I told him and recommended the
11 safest course is to submit the book. I even proposed
12 language in the contract that would relieve him of the
13 obligation to meet the publisher's timeline. This was
14 a business decision that he made, that they wanted to
15 get the book out, they had a short time to do it, they
16 needed to beat the competition. Someone in his chain
17 of Command was writing a book -- turned out to be
18 Admiral Nick Raven and Mr. Bowden -- and also that
19 they wanted to meet "Zero Dark 30".

20 So yeah, I recommended that the book should be
21 submitted. We revisited the issue in June when he
22 gave me the manuscript.

23 You know, here's the sense of urgency that was
24 going on there. They did not do a galley copy, and a
25 galley copy -- if you know anything about the

1 publication industry, a galley copy is where it's a
2 soft cover of the final draft that they send around to
3 the copyright editor. They send it to anyone else who
4 would have an interest in vetting the book. They went
5 right to final form. So it went from his manuscript
6 to final form. Why? Because they wanted to meet the
7 deadline, and that seemed to be very driven by the
8 publisher. The publisher was effectively -- what I
9 was getting -- the sense I was getting from
10 Bissonnette and Cheney was that the engine driving the
11 train here was the publisher pushing for this thing to
12 get done, and there was a looming threat of the
13 advance money being forfeited if they didn't get it
14 done on time.

15 So that was the restraints he was operating
16 under, and as I said, having reviewed with him the
17 ramifications, as well as the potential penalties for
18 not submitting the book, it was his decision to make.
19 That was a monumental decision for him to make.

20 Q Is your recommendation that he submit the book to a
21 Governmental review to be safe documented anywhere?

22 A Yeah, it's in that email that I sent to Ms. Cheney and
23 to Bissonnette, advising them that the -- that they
24 should include this or they should consider --
25 reconsider submitting the book to Governmental review

1 and proposed a clause to be included, which they
2 struck.

3 Q And do you remember what the clause was that you
4 recommended be included?

5 A Yeah, that -- as I sit here, to the best of my
6 recollection, it was that -- first off, that contract
7 that the publisher has is hopelessly amended, edited.
8 It looks like it was originally typed on a 1950 Smith
9 Corona and constantly added to; so there are addendums
10 and references and revisions to the thing, and it
11 seems to be internally inconsistent.

12 But to answer your question directly, I
13 recommended that the clause read, submit the book to
14 the Government relieving, Mr. Bissonnette of the
15 obligation under whatever paragraph it was to have the
16 manuscript produced by a certain date, because it
17 would be effectively out of his hands once it's
18 submitted for Government review.

19 (Exhibit 38
20 presented to the witness.)

21 Q Mr. Podlaski, I've handed you what is marked as
22 Exhibit 38, which appears to be an email from you to
23 Elyse Cheney, dated January 19, 2012 at 4:25 p.m., and
24 ask you if that is the Amendment you were talking
25 about that you proposed to the contract that they

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

63 <p>1 rejected. 2 A Just one moment. 3 (Pause) 4 A This document doesn't appear to have a Bates stamp. 5 Is it -- 6 Q Mine has a Bates stamp of KP319, but the copy you 7 have -- 8 A It appears to be different. 9 Q -- we got from another source. 10 (Pause) 11 MR. FURMAN: Randy, can I see yours? 12 MR. JOHNSTON: You bet. 13 MR. FURMAN: Is it just that the copy is missing 14 the Bates stamp? 15 MR. JOHNSTON: My belief is that the ones you 16 have, I had -- like you did yesterday, my legal 17 assistant printed out. This is the copy we either got 18 from Mr. Podlaski in the file production (indicating) 19 or from Elyse. Because it has the KP, my belief is -- 20 MR. FURMAN: The only -- 21 THE WITNESS: This is a different date/time group 22 -- 23 MR. FURMAN: Yeah, the documents seem different. 24 Just so I can make the record clear, I'm comparing 25 what is noted as KP00319 to 0320. It's a two-page</p>	65 <p>1 (Pause) 2 BY MR. JOHNSTON: 3 Q All right. 4 A To answer your question, that appears to be the 5 paragraph that I sent along with the other paragraphs 6 to Elyse and Mark Owen. 7 Q So when you're talking about you proposed language to 8 the contract to protect Mr. Owen in connection with 9 the timing of a pre-publication review, the language 10 in red on the front of that page is the language 11 you're talking about? 12 A I'll admit that I proposed this language in an effort 13 to protect Mr. Owen from not -- well, from the 14 publisher's requirement for the deadline. By 15 submitting it to the Government, it would be out of 16 his hands as to when or if the manuscript could be 17 delivered. 18 Q So what that -- what your proposed language protects 19 him from is Dutton wanting to do a pre-publication 20 review of the book? 21 A No, that's not it at all. 22 Q Well, read with me your proposal. "Although the 23 author has no legal obligation to submit the 24 manuscript to any agency of the U.S. Government for 25 review or approval, at the publisher's option the</p>
64 <p>1 document. And that has an email from Mr. Podlaski, 2 dated January 19th at -- 2012 at 4:25 p.m. to Elyse 3 Cheney with a copy to Kevin Podlaski. 4 And the document that's marked as Exhibit 38 is 5 also an email from Mr. Podlaski, dated January 19th. 6 It doesn't have the day listed, as is on document 7 ending in 19-20, and has a different time. Exhibit 38 8 is listed as 3:25 p.m., whereas the document that 9 Mr. Johnston provided me, which is KP0319-20 has 4:25 10 p.m. 11 It looks as if they're the same, and we could 12 review them together. I don't want to make any 13 assumptions, but could it have been simply just the 14 process of printing out? 15 MR. JOHNSTON: It may very well be. We can mark 16 as the official exhibit my copy, which has the Bates 17 number. 18 THE WITNESS: Why don't we do that. 19 MR. FURMAN: Yeah, that's fair enough. And it 20 simply might have just been the matter of printing off 21 of Microsoft Outlook, and I understand your office is 22 one behind Eastern time, and that could be the 23 difference in terms of the time. I'm just making the 24 assumption, pretending to have better knowledge than 25 anyone else in this room that might know.</p>	66 <p>1 publisher may direct the author to submit the 2 manuscript for a review. The parties recognize that 3 the author has no control over a review, and therefore 4 the author may not prescribe or impose a deadline by 5 which the review -- the agency must perform the 6 review." And I've paraphrased there. 7 Those are your words paraphrased, correct? 8 A That's correct. 9 Q And do you disagree with me that everything -- well, 10 let me continue. The next sentence, "Accordingly, if 11 the publisher chooses to direct the author to submit, 12 the author shall be relieved of the requirement to 13 deliver the manuscript by June 1." 14 Your words, correct? 15 A That's right. 16 Q There's nothing in here about Matt deciding to submit 17 it to a pre-pub review, is there? 18 A Because of the context in which not only we -- Matt 19 and Elyse and I -- were discussing the publication 20 contract, but also posturing it -- to my mind, 21 posturing it in a more palatable manner to the 22 publisher, giving them the decision to do so. 23 The context was that Elyse didn't think that they 24 were going to accept any changes to their contract, 25 that if they did, they would be all hard fought and</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	67		69
1	that the decision about the contract's change really 2 was in the publisher's ball -- I mean, it was in their 3 park, and they were really the ones who decided 4 whether they would accept these things or not. 5 So I was attempting to posture this in a language 6 that the publisher would buy in to, because it gave 7 the publisher the opportunity to submit the book. 8 Q And you started off your posturing with your proposed 9 change on January the 19th by saying, "The author has 10 no legal obligation to submit the manuscript to any 11 agency for review or approval." 12 A Right. And that comes as the result of the 13 conversation with Matt Bissonnette and Elizabeth -- 14 well, with Matt Bissonnette about what he signed and 15 what he didn't sign and about what his obligations 16 were. 17 Q Do you remember the date of your Engagement Letter? 18 A I believe it's January 18th, isn't it? 19 Q It says January 17 here. This is the unsigned one. 20 If the signed one matches that -- 21 A It was about that time. 22 Q So within a day or two of the signing of the 23 Engagement Letter, you were already proposing an 24 insert into the Dutton contract that confirms that 25 Mr. Bissonnette had no legal obligation to submit for	1 this email? 2 A Yeah, I might be wrong about the dates, but, I mean, 3 obviously, I wouldn't have written that if we hadn't 4 had a discussion; so I might be wrong about the dates 5 of that discussion. It was in early January. 6 Q So that would then mean your sworn Answers to 7 Interrogatories are also wrong again, correct? 8 A Well, I don't know about the -- 9 MR. FURMAN: Objection. 10 A -- "again" part of your comment. 11 Q Let me address that, because I don't want to be unfair 12 to you. You told me that there were phone calls that 13 took place in June that are not in the Answers to 14 Interrogatories, correct? 15 A That's correct. 16 Q So that would be a mistake, an error in the Answers to 17 Interrogatories? 18 MR. FURMAN: Objection. 19 A No, it would be an omission that was an innocent 20 omission. 21 Q I'm not attempting to attach guilt or innocence here, 22 innocence or not. You swore under oath in response to 23 Answers to Interrogatories, on which you had at least 24 30 days to think about it, that you had two phone 25 calls with Mr. Bissonnette, January 19, January 26,	
	68		70
1	a review, correct? 2 A Once again, based on my conversations with him. 3 Q That's the basis, but the fact is you made that 4 proposed change, correct? 5 A I made this proposed change apparently on the date 6 that the email indicates. 7 Q And the protection you were seeking to give 8 Mr. Bissonnette in this proposed change is protecting 9 him from the June 1 deadline obligation if the 10 publisher decided to submit independent of 11 Mr. Bissonnette, correct? 12 A No. As I said, you have to consider the context of 13 it, and it was a way to posture it so that the 14 publisher would buy in to the idea. We had -- Matt 15 and I had discussed that the safest course was to 16 submit the book for review, and this was my effort to 17 get the book to the Government for a review and it was 18 putting the decision to relieve Matt of the timeline 19 imposed by the publisher onto the publisher. 20 Q Can you explain to me why you are telling Ms. Cheney, 21 your client Mr. Bissonnette, on January 19 that he has 22 no legal obligation to submit the manuscript for 23 review, when, according to your earlier testimony, 24 everything you relied upon to make that decision 25 occurred in a phone call on January 25, six days after	1 and a couple in February; and you swore those were the 2 only phone calls you had with him, in your Answers to 3 Interrogatories, correct? 4 A Well, those were the ones that I recalled when I 5 prepared the Interrogatories. 6 Q And you took the preparation of Answers to 7 Interrogatories that you are swearing to under oath 8 and as an officer of the Court very seriously, 9 correct? 10 A When I answered the Interrogatories, I answered them 11 with what I knew and what I recalled at the time. 12 Q And there is no document that would have refreshed 13 your memory of, "Oh, yeah, there was another phone 14 call in June," correct? 15 A I don't believe that there is. 16 Q And if everything you told me about what happened in 17 the January 25 phone call and what you described as 18 having occurred in the January 25 phone call in your 19 Answers to Interrogatories really took place in a 20 phone call on January 19, that would be another error 21 in your sworn Answers to Interrogatories in this case. 22 A That would be your opinion, but it could be January 23 18th that those conversations took place, and so it 24 would just be because a couple years had passed and -- 25 you know, I wish I had a photographic memory, but I	

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

71 <p>1 don't. So to the best of my memory and recollection, 2 I both answered the Interrogatories with all of the 3 information that I knew and recalled at the time and 4 my testimony today with all of the information that I 5 recall.</p> <p>6 And moreover, we've seen that there's a couple 7 different versions of this, so I'm not sure if the 8 dates are even correct on this document.</p> <p>9 Q Do you question the dates?</p> <p>10 A I do.</p> <p>11 Q So you don't believe you sent this email on January 12 19?</p> <p>13 A I didn't say that. I just said I question the dates. 14 There's apparent discrepancies between the two 15 versions that you've produced.</p> <p>16 Q Is there a discrepancy on the date?</p> <p>17 A There's a discrepancy on the time.</p> <p>18 Q Is there a discrepancy on the date?</p> <p>19 A There appears not to be, but there's a discrepancy on 20 the time and a discrepancy on other marginal 21 information that leads me to believe that there may be 22 other versions out there.</p> <p>23 Q Other than what is reflected on Exhibit 38, did you 24 propose any other changes to the Dutton contract that 25 reflect Mr. Bissonnette's obligation to do a</p>	73 <p>1 Q And during your roughly 22 years in the military, were 2 you a JAG Officer that entire time?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q When did you become a JAG Officer?</p> <p>5 A 1991.</p> <p>6 Q Did the military pay for your attendance at law 7 school?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q So how did you go -- let me ask this. 10 Had you already graduated from law school in '82?</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 Q So you went to law school while you were in the 13 military?</p> <p>14 A For -- I had a break in service of 22 months. So I 15 went to law school at night for two of the four years 16 while I was on active duty.</p> <p>17 Q All right. And so you then graduated from law school 18 and passed the Bar -- went to law school, graduated 19 from law school, passed the Bar Exam during the time 20 of your military service?</p> <p>21 A On active duty for two of the four years. Then I was 22 out in the Reserves, and then I got called up during 23 Desert Shield.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. So you had left active duty when you started 25 law -- during part of your law school?</p>
72 <p>1 pre-publication review?</p> <p>2 A As I sit here today, I can't recall if there were any 3 other ones.</p> <p>4 Q In connection with your -- let me for a moment go into 5 your military career, sir; and some of this I just 6 need to know for background.</p> <p>7 When did you begin your military career, year?</p> <p>8 A 1982.</p> <p>9 Q And when -- do you still have your Commission?</p> <p>10 A I'm retired.</p> <p>11 Q Have you resigned your Commission?</p> <p>12 A Well, when one retires, you're still subject to 13 recall, but the further out you are from retirement 14 the less likely.</p> <p>15 Q I realize that.</p> <p>16 A So answering your question, no, I did not resign my 17 Commission.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. When did you retire from the military?</p> <p>19 A 2004, I believe it was.</p> <p>20 Q And what was the rank at the time you retired?</p> <p>21 A Major.</p> <p>22 Q Which branch of the service?</p> <p>23 A Army.</p> <p>24 Q How did you enter the military, with what rank?</p> <p>25 A I entered as a Second Lieutenant, ROTC Commission.</p>	74 <p>1 A I left active duty after my second year.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And then you were in the Reserves and were 3 recalled?</p> <p>4 A During Desert Shield.</p> <p>5 Q And when you were recalled, were you -- had you 6 already passed the Bar and become a lawyer?</p> <p>7 A I was a lawyer for about six months before that.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And did you, upon being recalled, immediately 9 enter the JAG Corps, or was it thereafter?</p> <p>10 A I was branch transferred to the JAG Corps prior to 11 being called up.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. During your time in the military, did you have 13 any combat service?</p> <p>14 A No.</p> <p>15 Q Did you have any time when you were stationed in the 16 Middle East anywhere?</p> <p>17 A Wait. Let me go back. I'm sorry. I thought you were 18 talking about the first time I was in the military.</p> <p>19 I was stationed in Bosnia, so that qualified as 20 combat area.</p> <p>21 Q I may have interrupted you. Anywhere other than 22 Bosnia?</p> <p>23 A I was -- the units I was deployed with, we deployed 24 regularly to South America in counternarcotics and 25 counterterrorism.</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

75	77
76	78

1 Q And did you personally serve in South America on those
2 assignments?
3 A Yes.
4 Q And when did you become associated with SOCOM, the
5 Special Operations Command?
6 A In 1991 I was assigned to Special Forces Headquarters,
7 and then I believe it was '92 I was assigned as the
8 7th Special Forces Group Judge Advocate, and both of
9 those assignments were at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.
10 Q And did you have any other changes in assignment
11 involving SOCOM from '92 on?
12 A Yes. After 7th Special Forces Group, I did a tour
13 with 18th Airborne Corps, again --
14 Q I'm sorry, with whom?
15 A 18th Airborne Corps.
16 Q Thank you.
17 A And then the Army sent me to University of Virginia
18 where the Army has its advanced course for attorneys,
19 and was there for a year, got an LLM, and then was in
20 Germany for four years, and then was assigned as the
21 Staff Judge Advocate for Special Operations Command
22 South.
23 Q During the time you were in Germany, were you still
24 associated with SOCOM?
25 A No. I was only -- once I left 7th Group, then I went

1 of the Army Special Forces, but primarily it consists
2 of the Green Berets and it consists of Special
3 Operations Aviation Regiment.
4 Q In connection with your time in service with SOCOM,
5 did you ever have connection with operations that were
6 a combination of Army Special Forces and SEALS
7 together?
8 A Yes.
9 Q How many times?
10 A With SOCOM, I was -- well, with Special Operations
11 Command South.
12 Q And to serve in the positions that you served in, did
13 you sign your own non-disclosure agreements?
14 A Yes.
15 Q Are you familiar with the non-disclosure agreements
16 that Special Force Operators would have signed?
17 A Yes.
18 Q Are those the same forms that Navy SEALS would have
19 signed?
20 A There is the Standard Form 312 for classified
21 information, non-disclosure agreements we discussed
22 previously, and there's the DD Form 1847-1 for
23 Sensitive Compartmented Information and Special Access
24 Programs. That's the highest level that I've worked
25 at or been exposed to. There may be others.

1 to 18th Airborne Corps. That was the end of my
2 association with SOCOM. My -- SOCOM is a
3 headquarters, a 4-star headquarters that does training
4 and doctrine.
5 So, that's -- to make a long story short, there's
6 Combatant Commands in Special Operations and there's
7 Training and Doctrine Commands in Special Operations.
8 So I was in 7th Group as a Combatant Command, and I
9 was in Special Operations Command South as a Combatant
10 Command. Headquarters Special Forces Command was a
11 Training and Doctrine, which is -- Headquarters
12 Special Forces Command directly falls under USSOCOM,
13 and 7th Special Forces Group falls under Special
14 Forces Command, but not for anything other than
15 Training and Doctrine.
16 Q When you say "Special Forces," what does that
17 encompass in the Army?
18 A Well, US Army Special Forces are -- there's Special
19 Forces Green Berets. US Army Special Forces Command
20 has what's known -- publicly known as Green Berets,
21 but associated in support of Special Forces is Special
22 Operations Aviation Regiment, which is helicopter
23 units. And there's people who have Special Operations
24 designation, meaning that they are qualified to work
25 with Special Operations or Special Forces in support

1 Q My question is are those the same forms for SEALS as
2 for Special Forces Operators in the Army?
3 A The Department of Defense forms and the standard
4 forms, yes.
5 Q And when you left the military, are there signs you
6 also -- I'm sorry. Are there also forms you also
7 signed when you were departing your military service?
8 A Well, when you -- yes, there are. But when you leave
9 a Special Operations Unit, you are debriefed and you
10 are sometimes questioned on your debriefing. There's
11 forms that you have to sign. And then there's always,
12 in my experience, a debriefing officer who is with the
13 Intelligence Section, debriefs you about all of your
14 foreign contacts, about all of the deployments that
15 you've been on; and moreover, if you are in a
16 compartmented program, you sign into that program and
17 upon conclusion of either your need to know or the
18 mission, you sign out and you're debriefed on that
19 particular mission.
20 Q Is it fair to say that as an attorney in the JAG Corps
21 of the Army with your SOCOM experience, you would have
22 been familiar with the types of documents
23 Mr. Bissonnette would have signed during his career as
24 a Navy SEAL ultimately at the end of his career up
25 into DEVGRU, up into the Development Group?

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	79		81
1 A Well, I think you have to be a little more specific. 2 That's a pretty broad range. Would I be familiar 3 with the classified information documents that he's -- 4 Q Let's stay with that. That's what I meant. 5 A Yeah, I think across the board -- I was in a Joint 6 Unit, and we used DoD forms, and we used standard 7 forms as required, and so I would be familiar with 8 regard to those documents. 9 Q And specifically with regard to the documents that are 10 attached to the Jeh Johnson letter, which is Exhibit 11 1, are those forms you would have expected 12 Mr. Bissonnette to have signed during the course of 13 his career and upon his exiting the service? 14 A Well, yes, generally. Those forms -- for example, 15 the -- there's a copy of the DD Form 1847-1 for 2007, 16 and those forms normally are associated -- there 17 should be a form for every compartmented or Special 18 Access Program that you're signed into. There should 19 also be a debriefing form for each program that you're 20 signed into. Now, you -- I've seen used where a 21 soldier or Airman or Navy SEAL have been involved with 22 more than one compartmented program and they may be 23 recorded on the same document but separate entries for 24 the dates that they were read on, and then a 25 debriefing form should likewise marry up with each of		1 level. He said no. I said -- in addition to not 2 recalling what exactly he did sign, with the exception 3 of the Standard Form 312. I said, "Well, I could 4 contact your former Unit Security Officer, and this is 5 just a simple document that says what your highest 6 level of access was, and that would enable us to make 7 a better decision." He said no, he did not want them 8 to know he was writing a book. 9 Q And is that recorded in any document that you know of? 10 A No. No, it's not, because at the time, he was very, 11 very emphatic about not having a great deal of 12 information and paper trails with the information 13 about the book. 14 Q When did that -- was that a telephone call? 15 A Yes. 16 Q When did that discussion take place? 17 A January 2012. 18 Q January 19 or 25? 19 A In there somewhere, yeah. 20 Q You don't know which one? 21 A I don't recall as I sit here which one. It could have 22 been earlier than that. 23 Q In any of the -- strike that. 24 Is it improper or illegal for someone who has 25 signed forms like the ones attached to Exhibit 1 to	
	80		82
1 the read-on programs or each of the compartmented 2 programs they were read on to, read off of. 3 Q Was it your experience in SOCOM in the JAG Corps that 4 copies of the documents that operators signed were 5 given to them after they signed them? 6 A Generally those documents were not given to. 7 Q Did it surprise you then that Mr. Bissonnette did not 8 have copies of documents he had signed during his 9 career? 10 A It didn't surprise me that he did not have them, but I 11 had asked him specifically if I could contact his 12 former Security Officer at his former unit and request 13 his -- the documents associated with his debriefing. 14 And there's also a form that's used to show the 15 highest level of classification that you have access 16 to. And he denied my request to do so. 17 Q I asked you earlier if he ever acted against your 18 advice. Was that acting against your advice, by 19 denying that request? 20 A Well, it was one of those things -- and this was 21 pretty early on. He was very concerned about his 22 security. He was also concerned about letting anybody 23 know he was writing the book, as he expressed 24 yesterday as well, and so when I -- I did ask him if 25 he had any documents related to his classification		1 write a book while they are on active duty? 2 A It's not illegal to write a book while you're on 3 active duty, but there are regulations that require 4 you, irrespective of the documents that you've signed, 5 the Classified Information Non-Disclosure 6 Agreements -- there are -- and specifically there's a 7 DoD directive that requires anyone on active duty to 8 submit to the office -- what used to be known as the 9 Office of Security and Policy Review; now I believe 10 it's known as the Office of Pre-Publication and 11 Security Review -- to submit any proposed public 12 speech or published writing for review if there is 13 classified information in it or you're uncertain as to 14 whether there's classified information in it. 15 Q So -- and the point that -- the distinction that I was 16 trying to make here is these documents do not prohibit 17 someone like Mr. Bissonnette from writing a book while 18 he is on active duty; they deal with his publishing 19 the book, correct? 20 A Yes, that's correct. 21 Q So whether he was on active duty or not when he was 22 writing the book is really irrelevant, isn't it? 23 A It just has to do with his obligation to submit the 24 book. So you could write a book, you can write 25 memoirs and notes, as long as -- if you're writing	

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	83		85
1	about classified information and it's not secured, 2 you're in violation of the regulation. If you are 3 capturing information from a Special Access Program 4 that mentions tactics, techniques, procedures, 5 communications, equipment, and it's not in a secure -- 6 actually what it's called is a SKIF, a Sensitive 7 Compartmented Information Facility, you're violating 8 the regulation. So --	1	Q So you will admit that you were hired to review for 2 that?
9	(Exhibit 14 10 presented to the witness)	3	A As I said, the Engagement Letter says it all. So it 4 says I'm reviewing the publishable manuscript to 5 ensure that he's in compliance with his obligations, 6 and that's part of the review process.
11	Q Let me show you what has been -- what was marked 12 yesterday as Exhibit 14. And do you have it there?	7	Q The operational tactics, techniques, and procedures 8 are part of the review process?
13	MR. FURMAN: I don't have 14.	9	A That's what you're screening for.
14	MR. JOHNSTON: This is one of the ones you marked 15 yesterday, so I only have my copy of it.	10	Q And the next sentence, "Mark seems to have a very 11 clear understanding of what this lawyer is saying. He 12 is going to get his papers from the Command Office and 13 then show those papers to this Indiana lawyer."
16	MR. FURMAN: Okay.	14	That did not happen, correct?
17	MR. JOHNSTON: May I walk around so I can direct 18 you all to what I'm talking about here?	15	A That's right.
19	MR. FURMAN: Sure.	16	Q Do you know why it didn't happen?
20	(Pause)	17	A As I said, he said he didn't have any and he refused 18 to allowed me to contact his Security Officer to get 19 them.
21	Q And you may look at or ignore my highlighting, because 22 this is my copy, but do you remember seeing this 23 document yesterday, Exhibit No. 14?	20	Q Then the next sentence, "The Indiana lawyer suggested 21 that Mark definitely not tell anyone in the Command 22 Office that he's doing a book."
24	A Yeah, I recall seeing this yesterday.	23	Did you recommend that Mark definitely not tell 24 anyone in the Command Office that he was doing a book?
25	Q Let me direct your attention to the latter half of	25	A I don't believe so.
	84		86
1	page 1. It purports to be an email from Elyse Cheney, 2 dated January 12. You may have to look at the page 3 before to see who it was to, but at the top Richard 4 Heller, right? And let me specifically direct you to 5 the second paragraph there. "We have a different 6 lawyer now in terms of the military review stuff. 7 It's a guy actually in Indiana who was a Special 8 Forces guy himself and then an attorney there and who 9 knows the agreements that anyone enlisted signs."	1	Q "That if he did they could potentially try to stop him 2 from leaving the military." 3 Does that sound familiar to you?
10	Is that you they're talking about there?	4	A No. And this is from Elyse Cheney, so I can tell you 5 right from the beginning that she did not have a good 6 grasp of much. I mean, the "military review stuff" is 7 what she says here, and saying I was a Special Forces 8 guy myself, never said that. So if this is from her 9 and they are talking about me, it illustrates that she 10 doesn't have a very good grasp and understanding of 11 what the issues were.
11	A I have no idea.	12	Q And I will not attempt to defend her complete 13 understanding of these issues. I see some of the 14 points you're raising. If -- had you spoken to her by 15 January 12?
12	Q Okay. "The key is that this lawyer be hired by 13 Penguin eventually to vet the manuscript and make sure 14 essentially that Mark is not revealing operational 15 tactics, techniques, and procedures."	16	A Yeah. That's what led me to believe that my dates 17 might be off, because I think I did speak to her early 18 on, and that was the first phone call I got from her, 19 and she was very cryptic at first and very circumspect 20 in not mentioning the person's name nor the mission 21 that the military person wanted to write a book about.
16	Let's talk about that sentence for a minute. You 17 were never hired by Penguin, correct?	22	So to answer your question directly, I did speak 23 with her earlier in 2000 -- earlier in January of 24 2012. I mean, when I spoke to her, it was clear she 25 didn't really want to be burdened with the details of
18	A That's correct.		
19	Q But you were hired to make sure that Mark is not 20 revealing operational tactics, techniques, or 21 procedures?		
22	A I'll admit only that I agreed to do what's in the Engagement Letter, and that was -- a part of the review is to review for operational tactics --		
25	tactics, techniques, and procedures.		

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	87	
1	anything having to do with the obligations about	1
2	classified information or an understanding of it.	2
3	Q Do you still have in front of you here, sir, your	3
4	memorandum to the record, or memorandum of record that	4
5	you dictated for yourself and the file?	5
6	MR. FURMAN: You marked it as Exhibit 35.	6
7	MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you.	7
8	A Yes.	8
9	Q What does that say in your Paragraph 1?	9
10	A It says, "On or about January 10th, 2012, I was	10
11	contacted by a literary agent from New York City or	11
12	NYC, Elyse Cheney, who asked me to assist a former	12
13	Navy SEAL who was preparing a manuscript about his	13
14	military career, and in particular his participation	14
15	in Operation Neptune Spear, which targeted Osama bin	15
16	Laden."	16
17	Q So would that indicate to you that Ms. Cheney had	17
18	spoken to you by the time she wrote this January 12	18
19	email to Mr. Heller?	19
20	A It appears to be so.	20
21	Q And while she may have gotten some things wrong, would	21
22	it appear to you that she is trying to report the	22
23	substance of her conversation with you in part?	23
24	MR. FURMAN: Objection.	24
25	A Yeah, that would cause me to speculate. I don't know	25
	88	
1	what she was trying to do.	1
2	Q Let me ask you this -- and I may have asked this, but	2
3	to be safe -- did you tell Mr. Bissonnette definitely	3
4	not to tell anyone in Command he was writing a book?	4
5	A I don't believe I ever told him that.	5
6	Q The latter half of that sentence says, "If he did,	6
7	they could potentially stop him from leaving the	7
8	military."	8
9	Do you remember saying anything like that?	9
10	A We -- like I said, the first phone call was with	10
11	Elyse, and then there's a phone call with Elyse and	11
12	Mark. I remember that distinctly. We discussed --	12
13	Q May I see your exhibit here?	13
14	A We discussed several things, and one of the things we	14
15	discussed was what his current status was, and he told	15
16	me he was currently on transition or terminal leave	16
17	and was going to be out of the military February 1st.	17
18	And so if this conversation was in early July -- so	18
19	it's plausible we had a discussion concerning his --	19
20	well, it kind of goes to my point. It proves my point	20
21	that we had a discussion about what your obligations	21
22	are on active duty and reporting and submitting	22
23	materials. And so it's plausible that we discussed	23
24	that if they became aware of the -- him writing a book	24
25	about the matter, that they may have tried to keep him	25
	90	
1	you're doing so -- if you're doing so while you're on	1
2	active duty and you don't properly store it.	2
3	Q So do you have any indication that he did not properly	3
4	store whatever writing he did while he was still on	4
5	active duty?	5
6	A Well, that causes me to speculate. I mean, I just	6
7	know that he and the ghost writer had prepared drafts,	7
8	and I saw the final copy. So I have no idea.	8
9	Q So has anyone, to your knowledge, ever complained	9
10	about the fact -- the Government specifically -- that	10
11	he was writing while on active duty and failed to	11
12	secure the writing in a manner that would protect it?	12
13	A I can't answer that question.	13
14	Q You know nothing about that one way or the other?	14
15	A I can't answer that question, because I don't believe	15
16	it was discussed. So --	16
17	Q So what is an author's obligation with regard to	17
18	secure storage after he is out of the military?	18
19	A Well, I mean, first off, you don't want to be writing	19
20	about things from a Special Access Program, and this	20
21	is the things -- these are the things that concern the	21
22	Government, is information from Special Access	22
23	Programs getting out into the public without review	23
24	and control of what it is. So, I mean, you have to	24
25	have a plan to take out the trash. And I don't	25

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

1 believe that there was a plan in place. As Matt 2 testified to yesterday and had previously said, he 3 wasn't planning on giving information that was going 4 to harm the United States, and I certainly wouldn't 5 have assisted him, and so -- I mean, he didn't have 6 that many changes. I didn't have that many changes to 7 his book, and I thought that they did do a good job of 8 screening out potentially classified information. 9 But as I said, you don't know what you don't 10 know; and when you write, you write at your own peril 11 for the Government coming back, if you don't submit 12 it, for saying that even if it's in the public domain, 13 you're confirming the fact in the public domain, and 14 they consider that to be a violation of the Classified 15 Information Non-Disclosure Agreement. 16 Q Objection; nonresponsive. 17 My question may have been unclear, so let me try 18 again. You testified that someone on active duty who 19 is writing a book that might even contain sensitive 20 information has to make certain how they store it to 21 be sure it doesn't get out. 22 Did I understand that correctly? 23 A That's the concern and yeah, generally, that's what -- 24 that's why if you're on active duty, you can't -- they 25 don't want you to release information without it being	91 1 don't have access. 2 Q Do you still have that DISCO clearance? 3 A I think it's expired now, but in connection with this 4 book, I think I have a TSSCI, again from the 5 Department of Defense and Department of Justice. 6 Q What's that? 7 A Top Secret Sensitive Compartmented Information 8 clearance in connection with this matter. 9 Q So in connection with your discussions with the 10 Government about the investigation of Mr. Bissonnette? 11 A Under my obligations, all I'm going to say is the 12 Government requested that I undergo a full background 13 investigation, and then my belief is that I have been 14 assigned a TSSCI in connection with their questioning 15 of me. 16 Q Is it your belief that you still have that TSSCI, or 17 is it limited to their questioning of you? 18 A Generally -- well, I'm sorry. When you undergo a 19 background investigation, you don't -- it's usually 20 not for a limited time. It's -- well, no, let me 21 rephrase that. I'm sorry. 22 Generally, background investigations are good for 23 five years, but that doesn't mean you have access. It 24 just means that you are eligible, and if you have a 25 change in your -- anything that would be considered	93
1 vetted. 2 Q I get that. Is it not true that even after you were 3 out of the service, if you're writing a book that 4 might contain sensitive information, you have an 5 obligation to protect that storage of the information 6 the same as if you were on active duty, until it's 7 cleared and clean and can go to the public? 8 A I can't disagree with you. 9 Q Okay. Now, did you consider -- let me jump to a 10 couple of predicate questions here. 11 In January of 2012, did you still have -- I'll 12 say still have any form of governmental security 13 clearance? 14 A In January of 2012, I had what's called a DISCO 15 clearance, which is Defense Industrial Security 16 Clearance Office, which is DoD industry for certain 17 programs that require vendors to be classified. I had 18 been working with a vendor who was involved with both 19 DoD and Department of State contracting, and they 20 wanted me to be cleared so that I could review 21 documents for them. So at the time, I had a DISCO 22 clearance of "Secret". But just because you have 23 clearance doesn't mean you have a need to know. 24 Q Right. 25 A And if you're not read on to a program, you still	92 1 disqualifying -- you get DUI, you file bankruptcy, 2 you're accused of a crime -- then you have an 3 obligation to report to the issuing agency that you 4 have this issue, and then they send your 5 information -- they have you fill out some forms, you 6 fill out your information, and it gets sent to what 7 they call an Adjudication Facility to determine 8 whether you still have access -- whether you still can 9 access classified information at that level you were 10 issued at or not. 11 So in answer to your question, do I still have 12 TSSCI? I believe so, for the remainder of the five 13 years after I was vetted. 14 Q I'm going to go back to the January time frame for 15 just a minute. 16 A Of 2012? 17 Q 2012, yes, sir. When you have your recordings on your 18 Memorandum of Record of the phone calls with 19 Mr. Bissonnette and we were talking about what can and 20 cannot happen when you are on active duty versus when 21 you're out of the service, when you've been 22 discharged, it was your understanding during those 23 January phone calls that he was still on active duty? 24 A Until February 1st. He told me he was out on February 25 1st.	94

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	95	
1	Q Okay. Did you in those phone calls say anything to 2 him about not writing anything until he was out? 3 A I think there was a discussion about whether he had 4 written anything, and he said no, he had not written 5 anything yet, and that was – 6 Q So did you tell him not to change that because he's 7 not out? 8 A Well, I think part of the discussion was when he told 9 me he was going to get with the ghost writer and pour 10 it out to him – and I think that's the term he 11 used – what he wanted to put out in the book, and he 12 said that that wasn't going to happen until March or 13 early April. 14 Q I understand. Simple question. Did you give him any 15 advice about what he should not do before he got out? 16 A I'm sorry. I didn't tie it in. So, no, I didn't say 17 to him, "Hey, don't write anything until you get out," 18 because his words to me indicated that he wasn't going 19 to do so until he was, as far as I knew, out after 20 February 1st. 21 Q Okay. In light of what you have told me about 22 security clearance and what I'll call a second issue, 23 which is either need to know or authority, do you 24 believe it was lawful for Mr. Bissonnette to send the 25 unreviewed transcript of his book to you when he did	97
	96	
1	in, I think, mid to late June? 2 A Well, the lawfulness of that is not really my call to 3 make. It's the Government's call. 4 Q Did you have any concern about exposing him to any 5 criminal or civil liability when you requested that he 6 send the manuscript to you for vetting? 7 A Well, it was part of the contract. So when you say 8 did I have a concern for his civil or criminal 9 liability, at that point I would say no, because 10 that's the standard process, is to prepare the book, 11 submit the book to the Government, and have the 12 Government come back and tell you to issue changes. 13 And they sometimes say, "Come back" -- they come back 14 and say, "You can't publish this. Destroy everything 15 you have." Or they come back and say, "You can't 16 publish this as it is. Here's the redactions we want 17 you to make, and you should delete all previous 18 versions and then send us your affirmation that you've 19 done so." 20 So, I knew that there was a process in place, but 21 once again, hey, look, here's the thing. Here's this 22 guy who is on a most sensitive mission that the US had 23 had in quite a while, and he did not want to 24 compromise the security of the United States or 25 anybody who had undertaken that mission with him.	98

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

99	101
<p>1 Access Program, I don't know if there is too much you 2 can do about it.</p> <p>3 I don't know if I answered your question except 4 to deal with the objective facts, and the objective 5 facts are no one has produced a DD Form 1847-1 in 6 connection with Operation Neptune Spear.</p> <p>7 Q And so knowing that no one has produced that -- and 8 let's assume no one can, for argument's sake -- do you 9 believe he -- sitting here today, do you believe he 10 had an obligation to submit the book for a 11 pre-publication review?</p> <p>12 A You're asking me for my opinion, and as I said, it's 13 complicated, and my opinion is not determinative, and 14 that's a decision for the Government.</p> <p>15 Q So if he came to you even today in November of 2016 16 and asked you, "You now know a lot more than you did 17 in 2012. Do I have an obligation to submit this book 18 for a pre-publication review," you could not tell him?</p> <p>19 MR. FURMAN: Objection.</p> <p>20 A I mean, you're asking me to speculate; but also, 21 benefiting from the experience, I would say to him, 22 "You'd be crazy not to, considering what you've gone 23 through here."</p> <p>24 So, I mean, whether he had an obligation, maybe 25 in his mind under 312 he does have a question about</p>	<p>1 an obligation or not?</p> <p>2 MR. FURMAN: Objection to the form of the 3 question.</p> <p>4 A Once again, you're asking me to answer a hypothetical 5 and give an opinion on it; and once again, the opinion 6 is the Government is the only entity that can decide 7 truly whether he is required to submit it. And I'm 8 not saying the Government even agrees with me and my 9 interpretation that 312 is discretionary. I think the 10 Government's position is that it's not discretionary, 11 at least with regard to this matter. You know, 12 there's a lot of things that would come into play.</p> <p>13 So to answer your question, I think it would take 14 more time and more study and analysis and a 15 determination about what is in the public domain and 16 what is not and what the ramifications of that are and 17 what they are not. The sensitivity of the mission now 18 compared to 11, 12 months after it was executed is a 19 big discriminating factor as well, and I would submit 20 to you that any assets that were in place at the time 21 the book was originally released are long gone from 22 there.</p> <p>23 It's a very long-winded answer, I understand and 24 I apologize, but it's not a simple question to ask 25 But, you know, the determination ultimately is the</p>
100	102
<p>1 whether it should be submitted; and then, therefore, 2 he would have an obligation. There's been no DD Form 3 1847. Just for further clarification, a Standard Form 4 312 does not have -- it's not mission specific. It's 5 a general form that you sign, and it's a big umbrella, 6 whereas the 1847-1 is a specific -- mission specific 7 form that you sign. And that's why I'm saying he may 8 have an obligation under 312. Knowing what he knows 9 now, I think he'd be foolish not to.</p> <p>10 Q And let me be real clear here. I'm not interested 11 in -- and my question probably wasn't clear in this 12 regard. I'm not interested in, "Well, what's the best 13 thing to do, knowing the load of crap you've had to go 14 through for two years," because clearly he could have 15 avoided that by submission.</p> <p>16 My question is limited to a legal obligation. 17 Let's assume he does not want to if he does not have 18 to; he will if he has to. Could you tell him today 19 whether he has to or not, based upon what you now 20 know?</p> <p>21 MR. FURMAN: Objection to the form of the 22 question.</p> <p>23 Q And I understand you might not be able to give him an 24 answer either way because there may be things you 25 don't know. Could you tell him today whether he has</p>	<p>1 client's. The recommendation that I would make in 2 this regard is the safest course is always submit.</p> <p>3 Q God, there was one question I was going to ask and 4 then take a lunch break.</p> <p>5 A You were going to ask me what I wanted for lunch.</p> <p>6 Q Probably. And I'll buy the lunch. Let's just break 7 for lunch and I'll remember it. It was kind of a 8 wrap-up-and-forget-about-it question, and I'm not 9 going to be able to wrap up and forget until I 10 remember. So let's break for lunch.</p> <p>11 MR. FURMAN: Sure.</p> <p>12 (Lunch recess)</p> <p>13 (Exhibit 39 14 presented to the witness.)</p> <p>15 BY MR. JOHNSTON:</p> <p>16 Q Mr. Podlaski, I have placed a new deposition Exhibit 17 No. 39 in front of you, and let me explain it. You 18 will recall the prior exhibit I put in front of you 19 that was your Memorandum of Record that had two pages, 20 and then there was a third page that seemed to -- that 21 was not present -- I'm sorry -- there was a third page 22 that seemed to be another version of the Memorandum of 23 Record, but it suggested there was a second page to 24 that other version and it was not attached. Okay. I 25 have found and printed out and marked as Exhibit 39</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	103		105
1 the entire document, just so we will have it, and you 2 can see there was a second page that contains two 3 additional sentences -- or two additional lines, I 4 will say, but the last sentence in that version of the 5 Memorandum of Record, which has Bates stamp 340, says 6 "And with my recommendation Mark decided not to send 7 the manuscript to USSOCOM PROSPR." 8 Those are your words, correct? 9 A You're talking about KP00341? 10 Q Yes, sir. 11 A Yes. 12 Q Okay. Let me ask you -- I remembered the one question 13 I was going to ask earlier when we were talking about 14 what advice you would give Mr. Podlaski if he came to 15 you today -- 16 MR. FURMAN: Mr. Bissonnette. 17 MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you. I will probably do 18 that more than once. That's my first time today, so 19 I'm way ahead of my normal batting average. 20 Q We were talking about what advice you would give 21 Mr. Bissonnette today based upon things that you have 22 learned since 2012. My question to you now is 23 somewhat related to that but different. Do you, as 24 you sit here today, criticize the settlement that 25 Mr. Bissonnette made with the Government as being	1 Q Okay. Let me ask you, what do the initials "SCI" 2 stand for? 3 A Sensitive Compartmented Information. 4 Q And what do the initials "SAP" stand for? 5 A Special Access Program. It depends on the context, of 6 course; but within what we're talking about here, 7 that's what I believe they mean. 8 Q And for purposes of the jury that may hear this case 9 who doesn't have the facile handling of these terms 10 that you do, is there a difference between those two 11 terms? Do they relate to each other in some fashion? 12 A To the extent of my knowledge, I think that generally 13 people who deal with classified information as a 14 profession, they might know of a distinction; but in 15 terminology that we've used and that we've ascribed, I 16 would say that there's not a difference between -- 17 well, the only difference would be this, that SCI is a 18 form of a Special Access Program. 19 Q Okay. You were aware that following the receipt of 20 the Jeh Johnson letter, the decision was made to 21 release the book earlier than its original release 22 date, correct? 23 A Yes. 24 Q Were you in agreement with that decision? 25 A I'm trying to think. That's why I'm pausing.		
	104		106
1 unreasonable? 2 MR. FURMAN: Objection. 3 You can answer. 4 A My opinion is that it's unclear why Mr. Bissonnette 5 settled with the Government and agreed to forfeit his 6 royalties, especially in light of his testimony 7 yesterday where he claimed that it was not an SAP 8 and -- at least in the beginning of his testimony, and 9 then at the end of his testimony asserted that the 10 2007 document 1847-1 applied to Operation Neptune 11 Spear. If you just look at the facts, the only 12 document that they produced -- "they" being the 13 Government produced that was relevant is the Standard 14 Form 312, which is an umbrella document that does not 15 have -- it's not mission specific, whereas the 16 1847-1's are, then I think it's unreasonable for him 17 to have agreed to forfeit all of his royalties when 18 the Government has not produced any document that ties 19 his signing of 1847-1 with Operation Neptune Spear. 20 They could have gotten an affidavit from one of the 21 briefers if they contend that it was a Special Access 22 Program, and then that would have -- if not 23 conclusive, that would have certainly been persuasive. 24 So in light of the facts that are on the table, I 25 believe that it is unreasonable.	1 I don't think I necessarily opposed it, but I 2 think I kind of felt like punched in the nose by 3 Mr. Luskin, so I was really kind of taking a back seat 4 at that point, unless I was directly asked a question. 5 And I don't think anybody directly asked me about 6 moving up the date, that I recall. And, you know, the 7 reality is that if the Government wanted to, the 8 Government could have issued a TRO or at least applied 9 for a TRO rather, and the Government could have, you 10 know, purchased all the books, like they've done in 11 previous circumstances, if they didn't want the book 12 released in its current form. You know, if -- I don't 13 think it was going to be an end run of the 14 Government's moving for a TRO if that's what they 15 wanted to do. 16 So to answer your question directly, I don't 17 recall whether I consented to that, but I can -- I'm 18 pretty sure that I did not say -- I did not lead the 19 charge on it, I will say. 20 Q Are you -- do you recall that on or about August 23rd, 21 Dutton sent out a press release announcing the pending 22 publication of the book? 23 A I believe so. 24 Q Did you see that press release before it went out, and 25 approve it?		

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: right;">107</p> <p>1 A I don't recall. I recall something about the press 2 release coming out. I think -- yeah, I think I did 3 review it.</p> <p>4 Q Did you approve it or have an objection to it in any 5 fashion?</p> <p>6 A I think I might have made a suggestion about some 7 language on it, but as I sit here, I really don't 8 remember the details.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. Yesterday Mr. Bissonnette was asked about a 10 reference to drones and power outages that are 11 described in some fashion in Mark Bowden's book. Do 12 you recall him being questioned about that generally?</p> <p>13 A I recall him being questioned about that.</p> <p>14 Q He indicated -- well, he didn't indicate a hesitancy. 15 He refused to talk about that. If I asked you about 16 drones and power outages, would you likewise refuse to 17 talk about that?</p> <p>18 A I would have nothing to say because I know nothing 19 about it.</p> <p>20 Q All right. That did shorten those questions. 21 I want to go -- well, let me see if I've got 22 other things to cover here before we jump too deep 23 into the documents.</p> <p>24 Do you recall when you first received kind of a 25 warning that the Government thought the release of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">109</p> <p>1 provide you with direction about what to do with 2 what's on your computer or what's in your trash bin. 3 So, you know, I didn't believe that there was much in 4 the book that was of concern, except as we've 5 previously discussed.</p> <p>6 So to answer your question directly, no, I wasn't 7 concerned at that time.</p> <p>8 Q Based upon your public -- based upon your knowledge of 9 public information about the bin Laden raid and the 10 involvement of the CIA, why do you believe that it -- 11 why do you not believe that it was a Special Access 12 Program?</p> <p>13 A Well, first off, I don't know what your understanding 14 is of the CIA's involvement, nor do I know what my 15 understanding is. And as far as public information 16 goes, if you've read Nick Schmidle's New Yorker 17 article, it's a lot more detailed and descriptive than 18 Mr. Bissonnette's book.</p> <p>19 So that decision is the Government's decision. 20 And about whether it came from a Special Access 21 Program, all I can tell you is all we know is what the 22 facts that are on the table. The Government has not 23 produced a Special Access Program -- any document, 24 including an 1847-1 -- signed by Mr. Bissonnette in 25 connection with Operation Neptune Spear, that I'm</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">108</p> <p>1 book would be illegal or in violation of 2 Mr. Bissonnette's obligations?</p> <p>3 A I recall when the advanced copies were put out -- and 4 I think this is where Mr. Bissonnette was confused on 5 the matter. When the advanced copies were put out, 6 there was some backblow from -- or backlash from -- 7 initially from USSOCOM I recall, and that was when 8 they first got the book and the title -- everybody 9 was -- I think Matt Bissonnette called the "three-foot 10 hover" and people were excited and upset. But then 11 subsequently I recall Kevin Maurer, who had a 12 relationship with Colonel Nye, I think is the guy's 13 name, was from USSOCOM, and there was some 14 communication. And after they read it, they were 15 like, "Okay, fine, but you should have submitted it to 16 us."</p> <p>17 Q Did you seek permission from any Governmental agency 18 to review the manuscript yourself?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q Given your understanding of SF 312, do you believe 21 that it was lawful for Mr. Bissonnette to provide you 22 a copy of his raw manuscript for review?</p> <p>23 A Well, this kind of goes back to earlier where we were 24 talking about and somebody -- if the Government 25 determines that it is classified and they usually</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">110</p> <p>1 aware of.</p> <p>2 Q And what I'm trying to focus on is, in the absence of 3 the Government producing such a document, the primary 4 fact on which you rely in connection with your belief 5 that it was not a Special Access Program.</p> <p>6 A That and Mr. Bissonnette's words to me and his own 7 testimony is that he did not recall receiving any 8 briefing that anyone said this was a Special Access 9 Program or that this was Sensitive Compartmented 10 Information.</p> <p>11 So, like I said, if you just deal with the facts, 12 I haven't seen facts to convince me that it was a 13 Special Access Program. But I don't know what I don't 14 know.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Would you agree with me that when the Jeh 16 Johnson letter arrived on the evening of August 30 -- 17 and I guess we don't have the facsimile transmission, 18 but my memory is that it was after normal office hours 19 on that Thursday evening -- that as of the moment 20 Mr. Luskin was hired, you had had more time to 21 consider and wrestle with the problems of the 22 Government objecting to the release of the book than 23 he had had?</p> <p>24 And by the way, I just found on the second page 25 of Exhibit 1 what appears to be, I guess, a facsimile</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: center;">111</p> <p>1 transmission August 30, 2012, 19:25. So I'm assuming 2 it was 7:25 in the evening when it was transmitted. 3 A Right. I didn't get it at that time. Apparently that 4 went to the publisher first. 5 Q That's my understanding. 6 A And was filtered out and distributed. 7 To answer your question, I think what you're 8 asking me -- 9 MR. FURMAN: Hold on. Can we have the question 10 read back? 11 (Court Reporter read back.) 12 A If you're asking me if I was -- I spent more time on 13 the manuscript than Mr. Luskin, then the answer is 14 yes. 15 Q Well, isn't it true that around August 23, when the 16 press release went out and apparently some advance 17 copies of the book, almost immediately you all were 18 put on notice that the Government was claiming there 19 were violations by Mr. Bissonnette? 20 A I would say that, yeah, we were aware that there was 21 some parts of the Government, some agencies of the 22 Government that had received the book, thought it 23 violated the Non-Disclosure Agreement. 24 Q And let me show you Exhibit 2. We were talking about 25 when you received Exhibit 1. Exhibit 2 appears to be</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">113</p> <p>1 "Apparently I signed an SAP," right? 2 A Yeah, but he doesn't necessarily -- well, he says, "I 3 signed an SAP and I honestly don't remember signing 4 it." 5 MR. FURMAN: Yeah. I just want the record to be 6 clear that what Mr. Bissonnette wrote was, "Apparently 7 I did sign some sort of SAP program documents." It 8 doesn't say that he signed some SAP. An SEI would be 9 an SAP program document. So I think that's the 10 shorthand, and there's some confusion over acronyms, 11 and I just wanted to make that clear. 12 A And moreover, he says he linked it to the one in 2007. 13 He says, "I don't remember signing anything in 2007." 14 Q Well, is the 2007 document an SAP document? 15 A I think it's an 1847-1. And I don't have it in front 16 of me right now. 17 Q Yes, you do (indicating). 18 A Okay. Great. And your question again is is this an 19 SAP document? 20 Q Right. 21 A Well, I believe that this is a document saying that 22 this signer agrees that they're receiving Sensitive 23 Compartmented Information, and Sensitive Compartmented 24 Information are under the umbrella of Special Access 25 Programs.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">112</p> <p>1 an email to you from Mr. Owen about midnight of that 2 same day, alerting you to the receipt of it, correct? 3 A That was an email from Mark Owen to Ben Sevier. I was 4 copied on it. And then it looks like an admission -- 5 in the first sentence there, Mark says, "It looks like 6 the does there" -- "apparently I did sign some form of 7 SAP docs." But like I said, the document didn't 8 link -- the 1847-1 from 2007 didn't link it to 9 Operation Neptune Spear. 10 Q Right. My point is simply you knew about the Jeh 11 Johnson letter very quickly, didn't you? 12 A Yeah. I mean, I can pretty much assure you that I was 13 in bed by that time, so I didn't read it until the 14 next morning. 15 Q Okay. So it would be fair to assume that by the next 16 morning, August 31, you would have known about the Jeh 17 Johnson letter? 18 A Yes. 19 Q Okay. And is it also fair to say in connection with 20 Exhibit 2 that that document confirms that even when 21 shown documents he signed, Mr. Bissonnette doesn't 22 really understand them? 23 MR. FURMAN: Objection as to what -- objection. 24 A Yeah, you're asking me to speculate on this. 25 Q Let me be more specific. He described -- he says,</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">114</p> <p>1 Q Do you agree with me that Mr. Bissonnette's statement 2 in his email on Exhibit 2 is that he signed some sort 3 of SAP program docs, based upon what you know? 4 A I agree that the document you just showed me indicates 5 his signature on a document from 2007, yes. 6 Q Is that some sort of SAP program doc? 7 A Yeah, I believe an SCI is under the SAP or Special 8 Access Program umbrella; so yes. 9 (Exhibit 40 10 marked for identification.) 11 Q Mr. Podlaski, let me direct your attention to what's an 12 email from Kevin Podlaski to Kevin Podlaski. Do you 13 know why you would have sent yourself a document? 14 A Yeah. I sometimes do that just to make sure that I 15 remember and don't get distracted by other business, 16 that it's on my current agenda. 17 Q Sure. 18 A So I email myself sometimes. 19 Q Okay. And in this particular instance, it says, 20 "Revision to paragraph 47." 21 Do you believe that to be Paragraph 47 of the 22 Dutton contract, or is that some other Paragraph 47? 23 A As I sit here, I really don't know, because I don't 24 remember. 25</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p>1 Q Okay. And then what you wrote in the email to 2 yourself for a reminder was, "Although the author has 3 the legal right to tell the story described in the 4 subject matter description above," comma, "he has 5 previously signed one or more agreements with the US 6 Government not to disclose and/or write about 7 classified or classifiable information."</p> <p>8 On January 18, when you sent that email to 9 yourself, did you believe that to be a true statement?</p> <p>10 A I have no idea what I would -- what I remember is 11 these were probably just my notes to myself for things 12 to further analyze or review.</p> <p>13 Q So you don't know if what you wrote to yourself as a 14 revision to Paragraph 47 is a statement you believed 15 at the time or not?</p> <p>16 A Yeah, no. No, I'm not going to say that. I think 17 it's just a draft of wording, trying to effectuate 18 something that either I thought about or the client 19 wanted, and I can't recall as I sit here.</p> <p>20 Q And then the second sentence says, "The author has no 21 legal obligation to submit the manuscript for review 22 or approval by any agency of the US Government."</p> <p>23 On January 18 when you included that sentence in 24 the email to yourself, did you believe that to be a 25 true statement?</p>	<p>1 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I answered the question.</p> <p>2 MR. FURMAN: Okay.</p> <p>3 (Exhibit 41</p> <p>4 marked for identification.)</p> <p>5 Q Mr. Podlaski, I've handed what's marked as Exhibit 41, 6 which is an email chain which includes portions of 7 Exhibit 38, and that's not the part I want to direct 8 your attention to.</p> <p>9 On the first page of the document, there is an 10 email from you to Elyse. The first sentence of the 11 paragraph says, "Please don't take offense to this 12 question, however, I was wondering if Mark's story and 13 Mark have been vetted yet."</p> <p>14 Do you remember initiating that inquiry to 15 Ms. Cheney?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q And there's no date on this email from you, but the 18 reply from her above is dated January 21. Does that 19 sound like about the time you would have made that 20 inquiry to her?</p> <p>21 A On or before that, yes.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And then the second paragraph, it says, "It 23 occurs to me that I have been caught up in the 24 excitement" -- with "excitement" in quotes -- "of 25 being among the first to know the inside story that I</p>
<p>116</p> <p>1 A Yeah, based on what Mr. Bissonnette had provided to me 2 in the way of information.</p> <p>3 Q Did you produce these notes as a part of the 4 Bissonnette file in the first production?</p> <p>5 A I have no idea.</p> <p>6 Q Was it a part of your hard copy of the file that was 7 produced?</p> <p>8 A Probably not; but I don't know.</p> <p>9 MR. FURMAN: I have, off the record, a quick 10 housekeeping question.</p> <p>11 MR. JOHNSTON: Sure. 12 (Discussion held off the record.)</p> <p>13 Q I'm hoping I don't have to go through these emails, so 14 let me ask just kind of a global question and see if 15 you remember.</p> <p>16 Do you remember consulting with Mr. Bissonnette, 17 through Ms. Cheney sometimes, about hiding his 18 identity through the formation of LLC's?</p> <p>19 A I do.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. And you gave him advice in connection with 21 that?</p> <p>22 A I did.</p> <p>23 Q Okay.</p> <p>24 MR. FURMAN: Is there something you wanted to add 25 to that in response to the question?</p>	<p>118</p> <p>1 have failed to question let alone validate Mark's 2 training, background, and credentials."</p> <p>3 Is that an accurate statement of your state of 4 mind about this engagement as of the date you sent 5 that email?</p> <p>6 MR. FURMAN: Objection.</p> <p>7 You can answer.</p> <p>8 A It says what it says. My use of the word "excitement" 9 was just, you know, still very noteworthy event that 10 had occurred within the year.</p> <p>11 (Exhibit 42</p> <p>12 marked for identification.)</p> <p>13 Q Mr. Podlaski, I've handed you Exhibit 42, and again, 14 it is an email string involving some emails that I 15 believe you were not copied on but they are in this 16 email forwarded to you. I really want to direct your 17 attention only to the very top of the document. It's 18 dated February 6th, 2012 from Ms. Cheney to you. And 19 then in the -- towards the end of that document she 20 says, "I'm going to go in and talk to the general 21 counsel, with the other lawyer - Rich Heller - at my 22 side because Heller has a pre-existing relationship 23 with the Penguin's general counsel."</p> <p>24 I bring that up to see if that refreshes your 25 recollection any further about the fact that Matt had</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	123		125
1	A We -- yeah --	1	Q Did he receive and review it simultaneously with you?
2	Q Hypothetically.	2	A I don't know.
3	A You're asking me a hypothetical question. First of	3	Q Did you ever express any concern to Mr. Bissonnette
4	all, are we talking about Matt Bissonnette? Because	4	that he should not review it until you had vetted it?
5	you said retired SEAL. He's not retired, was he?	5	MR. FURMAN: I think -- could we have the
6	Q I don't know what "retired SEAL" means, so let me just	6	question read back?
7	use his name. One of the things that you did when you	7	MR. JOHNSTON: Did I misspeak?
8	reviewed the book was search for anything that you	8	MR. FURMAN: Or maybe I misheard.
9	thought was TTP.	9	Q Let me just try again.
10	A Correct.	10	Did you ever indicate to Mr. Bissonnette that
11	Q Because you knew that he was not to reveal TTP?	11	Mr. Sevier should not review the manuscript until
12	A Correct.	12	after you had vetted it?
13	Q And as a former JAG Officer who served this country	13	A My recollection is that I suggested that I review it
14	long and well and someone who cares about this country	14	before the editor review it in an effort to do a
15	and other men serving today, you would not have	15	cleanse -- cleansing review and try to remove anything
16	allowed him to reveal TTP, except over your strenuous	16	that would be considered classified or classifiable.
17	objection, correct?	17	And I don't really recall whether I got voted down
18	A Well, as I said, we would discuss it; and as a matter	18	or -- because that email that you showed me previously
19	of fact, without saying specifically what it is, we	19	from Elyse Cheney seems to indicate that they wanted
20	did have a discussion about certain items in there,	20	to do it simultaneously. So, you know --
21	and he decided to include it in there. So --	21	Q Do you recall objecting to that?
22	Q As you sit here today, do you -- I probably asked	22	A Well, like I said, I expressed to them that I believed
23	this. Do you believe there are TTP revealed in the	23	that I should review it first so that we could have a
24	book?	24	chance to go back and forth; and, of course, when
25	A Not that I am aware of which would compromise national	25	you're dealing with information that's potentially
	124		126
1	security.	1	classified, you want to have as minimal amount of
2	Q Thank you.	2	people review it as possible.
3	(Exhibit 45	3	Q Sure.
4	marked for identification.)	4	A As I sit here today, I don't recall -- I don't think
5	Q Mr. Podlaski, I've handed you Exhibit 45, which is an	5	it was a big point of contention. I think they either
6	email from Ben Sevier to you with a copy to Alex at	6	did it or they didn't do it. I forget.
7	Elyse Cheney's office and a copy to Ms. Cheney, dated	7	Q Is there -- let me go ahead and hand that to you.
8	Saturday, June 23rd, Attachments: NO EASY DAY	8	(Pause)
9	complete third draft with edits June 23.doc.	9	Q Before you get lost in it, is there any document that
10	Do you remember receiving this document and the	10	you know of where you expressed to them reservations
11	Attachment?	11	about Mr. Sevier looking at the document before you
12	A I don't have an independent recollection of receiving	12	had vetted it?
13	this, but I have no reason to deny that I did receive	13	A I don't know -- wait. I'm sorry. I got distracted.
14	the final draft.	14	Ask the question again.
15	Q Was this the transmittal of the draft -- the first	15	Q Do you know of any document where you expressed to
16	transmittal of the draft to you for you to do your	16	them any reservation about Mr. Sevier reviewing the
17	vetting?	17	manuscript before you had vetted it?
18	A Huh-uh. This is the third and final draft. I think	18	MR. FURMAN: And "them" -- we have the same
19	this is after I had added the footnotes, and then we	19	question. Who is "them"?
20	went around and they took those out and changed them	20	Q "Them" is Matt, Elyse, Sevier, anybody?
21	to endnotes, and then I think that this is just the	21	A Yeah, I don't know -- I think there must be something
22	reference-cited one.	22	in writing. We talked about me reviewing it first,
23	Q Okay. Did Ben Sevier receive and/or review the	23	and you saw Elyse's email kind of capturing some of
24	manuscript before you did?	24	that. She was saying she didn't think they'd go for
25	A I don't know.	25	it. I believe that's what I just recall reading,

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p>1 because they wanted, you know, to fast track it, et 2 cetera. So I don't really remember what the ultimate 3 spillout of the thing was.</p> <p>4 Q Do you know of any document other than the ones that 5 we looked at that discuss that subject?</p> <p>6 A If there is any other document, it would be part of 7 the email exchange, and there's nothing other -- 8 anything independent of that.</p> <p>9 (Exhibit 46 10 marked for identification.)</p> <p>11 Q Okay. Do you have in front of you Exhibit 46?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q This appears to be an email from Krista Witmer to you, 14 dated June 22, with the subject of "Mark Owens 15 beginning of book". Who is Krista Witmer?</p> <p>16 A She was my secretary. I dictated it. She typed it up 17 and sent it to me.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. So you would have dictated this and this is 19 simply sending back to you what you had dictated?</p> <p>20 A That's correct.</p> <p>21 Q Okay.</p> <p>22 A She doesn't work at Carson Boxberger anymore. I don't 23 even know where she is.</p> <p>24 Q So she didn't follow you to your new firm?</p> <p>25 A No, she did not.</p>	<p>127</p> <p>1 Q -- where he is thanking you for the quick turnaround. 2 And then below that is an email from you to the two of 3 them where you enclose suggested revisions and 4 alterations and changes to the manuscript that you 5 propose, and then you end that by saying, "I don't 6 think the story is diminished or compromised in any 7 manner by my suggested changes," correct?</p> <p>8 A You're asking me if that's what I wrote?</p> <p>9 Q Yes, those are your words?</p> <p>10 A That appears to be what I wrote, yes.</p> <p>11 Q And are the changes that we are talking about here a 12 part of your vetting process to ensure that classified 13 confidential information is not disclosed?</p> <p>14 A Yeah, I don't know what -- I mean, this -- the Subject 15 is the third draft, so I think I had already -- well, 16 the first thing, this was like a crapload of 17 grammatical and punctuation errors -- which I was kind 18 of surprised that a ghost writer didn't fix, subject 19 for disagreements and all that, but I also did the 20 footnote work and all of that. So I think this was 21 after -- this is after even this -- yeah, this is 22 after this document (indicating) when they rejected 23 that as well. So this must have been on the -- this 24 might have been happy-to-glad word changes.</p> <p>25 (Exhibit 48</p>
<p>128</p>	<p>130</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	131		133
1 Q Well, let's go up from page 2105, since the email 2 is -- 3 A Forward or backward? 4 Q The emails proceed, I think, to the front of the 5 document; so we'll start and go up. 6 A Oh, I see what you're saying. 7 Q The first one is Kevin Maurer to Ben where he says, 8 "Mark and I talked this morning and completed the 9 lawyer edits, including open source citations." And 10 then he says, "Mark and I are ready to discuss the 11 edits today." 12 A Yeah. 13 Q And then there is a -- 14 A Just for the record, I'm not on that discussion, 15 right? 16 Q Right, correct. This is just for background. 17 A Um-hum. 18 Q And then above that is Ben Sevier to Kevin, Elyse, 19 Mark, and Alex where he says, "I've just reviewed them 20 as well and I think the lawyer has made a significant 21 contribution here. I'm very happy to have his review. 22 Kevin and Mark and I will get all of his changes 23 incorporated today." 24 That's talking about your changes, correct? 25 A Right.	1 A Independent memory, no. 2 Q Okay. And then above that, same day, just, I guess, 3 20 minutes later is you replying to Alex, saying, "I 4 have no problem at all with the changes proposed in 5 the Foreword. I agree with the reasoning for the 6 changes." Correct? 7 A Yeah. That's the first format, though, the first 8 change. Ultimately it was further changed. 9 Q And then you say, "Regarding open source citations: 10 They are not necessary to list as footnotes. End 11 Notes are fine." 12 A Yeah, I did say that. 13 Q And then third paragraph, you would like to review any 14 maps and then you say, "The military has several 15 regulations on photographs depending on who took the 16 photos." 17 A Um-hum. 18 Q And then you say, "Finally, may I please see the 19 'uncorrected proof' of the manuscript for a final once 20 over when you get to that stage?" 21 A Right. That's the galley copy I was talking about. 22 Q Okay. And then the next one above that is another 23 email from you to Alex and Ben, the same day but I 24 guess about three or four hours later, and you say, "I 25 think the pictures are legally okay except for the		
	132		134
1 Q And then it says, "I have two questions for him. Is 2 it necessary to print open sources in the book or can 3 we simply address their existence in the foreword?" 4 And then 2, "I've made some edits to the proposed 5 foreword in the attached document and I would like to 6 know if they are acceptable to the lawyer and Mark." 7 A One thing we know for sure is Ben can't count. 8 Q Yeah, I'll give you that. 9 3, "Has he seen the maps that Mark and Travis 10 Rightmeyer prepared?" 11 And then his final paragraph, "Alex, maybe you 12 want to forward this to him. Maybe we don't need a 13 conference call; his work was excellent, so there's 14 really not that much to discuss, although I'm free all 15 afternoon." 16 And then the next email -- 17 A Gosh, I hope they're talking about me as the lawyer. 18 Q I can assure you they are. The next email up is Alex 19 doing what Ben suggested, forwarding that email to 20 you. "Kevin, the team is hard at work incorporating 21 the changes you suggested, thank you. Can you take a 22 look at Ben's questions below and also his slight 23 tweak to your foreword? Happy to set up a call if 24 that's easier." 25 Do you remember getting that email?	1 NVG's." And for the benefit of the jury, the NVG's is 2 the night vision goggles? 3 A Correct. 4 Q And then you say, "This is out of my lane, but I'm not 5 sure you need all the maps. No legal issues with 6 them, it just occurs to me if you have 8 Maps, you 7 don't really need to read the book." 8 Then over on to the other page you continue to 9 say, "The maps and diagrams were created by a mapmaker 10 from" -- I'm sorry. That's Alex's email. So that was 11 all of your email. 12 And then one more above it. There is another 13 email from you the following day, June 29, with lawyer 14 edits as the issue, and you say, "Out of an abundance 15 of caution a question. I reached out but did not find 16 the type of NVG's that are displayed. I was wondering 17 whether they were military specification or not? If 18 they are military specification I would recommend -- I 19 would not recommend including a picture." 20 Do you remember focusing on the NVG's and making 21 that recommendation? 22 A Now I do. 23 Q And then at the top of the page, the last email that's 24 a part of this exhibit is Alex back to you where he says, "Mark says they're simply panoramic night vision		

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

135	137
1 goggles, not secret military technology, which are 2 searchable on Google. They're also featured in Medal 3 of Honor video games. If you think there are other 4 outstanding issues, I think it might be fastest to 5 communicate with Mark directly." 6 Did that satisfy your concern about the night 7 vision goggles? 8 A No. Mark and I had a conversation. 9 Q Okay. And -- 10 A In that conversation, he directed me to the website 11 where they were commercially available, and so -- 12 Q Your memory is excellent on that. Let me show you 13 Exhibit 49. 14 (Exhibit 49 15 presented to the witness.) 16 A I know you're on a roll here, but I need to give you a 17 warning. I need to go to the bathroom shortly. 18 Q Let's finish this and you can do that. 19 Exhibit 49 is an email from you to AB. Is that 20 an acronym for Matt Bissonnette? 21 A Where's this? 22 Q At the very top of the page. From you to AB, Jacobs 23 Alex? 24 A I don't know. I believe that he might have used that, 25 but I don't know for sure.	1 capabilities are. Because it was saturated in public 2 domain at that point, it was -- I think my 3 recommendation was that it would be fine. 4 Q So you didn't change your recommendation for what is 5 reflected on Exhibit 49, the pictures are fine? 6 A That's correct, yeah. 7 Q And this telephone call you're talking about in June, 8 this is another telephone call? 9 A No, this is one of the two that I had with him after I 10 got the manuscript. 11 Q Okay. 12 A I had one conversation with him and Kevin Maurer and 13 then one just with him, that I recall. 14 Q Let's take a break. 15 (Recess) 16 (Exhibit 50 17 marked for identification.) 18 BY MR. JOHNSTON: 19 Q I've handed you Exhibit 50, and I want to direct your 20 attention to the email at the bottom of the page 21 numbered 2421, the email from Mr. Sevier to you. Do 22 you see that? 23 A Tuesday, July 3rd, the 2:59 p.m. one? 24 Q Correct. 25 A Okay. I see it.
136	138

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	139	141
<p>1 A That's what it appears to be. 2 Q And it's dated August 15 of 2012, correct? 3 A It's -- that's what the fax line appears to be. 4 Q And then the second page appears to be the Dutton 5 press release announcing the soon-to-be published "No 6 Easy Day," correct? 7 A That's what it says, yeah. 8 Q And do you remember seeing this press release before 9 it went out? 10 A Vaguely, yeah. 11 Q Did you have any objection to it? 12 A I don't recall if I did. 13 Q Let me show you what's marked as Exhibit 52. 14 (Exhibit 52 15 marked for identification.) 16 Q It has on August 20 an email from you to Ms. Cheney, 17 under the Subject: URGENT approval needed. And you 18 say to her, "I like it." 19 Do you know if that is talking about the press 20 release? 21 A As I sit here, I really honestly don't know. It seems 22 to be -- well, I don't know. 23 Q Let me show you Exhibit 53. 24 (Exhibit 53 25 marked for identification.)</p>	<p>1 Q This is where the -- would I be accurate in saying 2 this is where the trouble started with the book? 3 A I don't know if you'd be accurate in saying this. I 4 mean, this is just one guy's opinion. 5 Q I agree with that. 6 A And he's a newspaper -- 7 Q No, I get it. 8 A -- correspondent. 9 Q Is this the first notice that anyone had -- whether 10 reliable or not -- from a source that said the 11 Government had problems with the book? 12 A I don't know. I mean, I wasn't the pivot person for 13 receiving and channeling responses. From what I 14 recall, Kevin Maurer was kind of spearheading the 15 release -- the advance copy placement and receiving of 16 info on that -- on those books. 17 Q The email from Ms. Cheney to you and others, to you 18 and Ms. Ball and Mr. Ragone -- I'm not sure how -- 19 A Ragone, yeah. 20 Q Okay. Her email says, "Can someone give this guy a 21 statement of the truth? He had no obligation to show 22 it to them." 23 Do you know why Ms. Cheney was of the opinion 24 that Mr. Bissonnette had no obligation to show the 25 book to the Government for a pre-publication review.</p>	
	140	142
<p>1 Q Let me just ask you this before we go to 53. Without 2 regard to your memory of Exhibit 52, when you saw the 3 press release that Dutton was proposing, did you like 4 it? 5 MR. FURMAN: Objection. Objection to the form of 6 the question as to whether he liked it. Enough said. 7 A You know, I don't recall what I thought at the time, 8 but as I look at it, the thing I think I should have 9 taken issue with is "and many previously unreported 10 missions," but I don't -- taken out of context, it 11 doesn't mean anything. 12 Q Do you recall at the time that you reviewed it 13 expressing any concerns or reservation about the press 14 release? 15 A No. As I said, I don't recall. 16 Q Do you have Exhibit 53 in front of you? 17 A Yes. 18 Q Exhibit 53 is a series of emails. I will tell you you 19 are included only on the very last one at the top of 20 the first page. 21 A Right. 22 Q Do you remember this series of emails that began with 23 Mr. Mark Hosenball from Thomson Reuters emailing with 24 Ms. Cheney about Mr. Bissonnette and the book? 25 A Yes, I recall. I recall generally, yes.</p>	<p>1 A I don't know why Ms. Cheney did anything. 2 Q Would it be true that the reason she had that belief 3 is because that's what you had told her? 4 A You're asking me to speculate. I don't know the 5 answer to that question. 6 Q Let me show you what's marked as Exhibit 54. 7 (Exhibit 54 8 marked for identification.) 9 Q It is a continuation of that email chain, and there's 10 three or four of these, because people would reply and 11 start new chains, but I think the first reference to 12 you is -- well, yeah, on page 2, the 2248, down at the 13 bottom there is Ms. Cheney's email to you and the 14 others, "Can someone give this guy a statement of the 15 truth?" 16 And then there's -- a Christine Ball replied, 17 "Peter and I spoke and we don't think anyone should be 18 responding to him." 19 And then Ragone replies, "I'll call you in a 20 second." 21 And then you reply, and your reply starts on page 22 1 and goes over to the top of page 2. And is it a 23 fair statement that in your reply of August 23 to 24 Elyse and Mark and the others, you repeat and defend 25 your recommendation that he had no obligation to</p>	

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: right;">143</p> <p>1 submit to a pre-publication review?</p> <p>2 A That's what's written there, yes.</p> <p>3 Q And then on the second page of the document, which is</p> <p>4 a continuation of your email, you say, "As discussed</p> <p>5 from the beginning, all this is hand wringing prior to</p> <p>6 anybody reading the book. The book reveals nothing</p> <p>7 new except Mark's personal observations."</p> <p>8 A This correspondent didn't receive an advanced copy of</p> <p>9 the book. He did, by this time, see the press</p> <p>10 release, and so he's doing a knee jerk reaction to the</p> <p>11 pre-release without ever reading -- ever breaking</p> <p>12 the book cover. And he might have spoken with someone</p> <p>13 at one of the places where the book was released, but</p> <p>14 they were still reviewing it. And I seriously doubt</p> <p>15 they were telling this guy anything other than the</p> <p>16 party line which was, you know, until it's reviewed,</p> <p>17 you know, everything is suspect.</p> <p>18 Q Right.</p> <p>19 A So Hosenball, he was doing what he's supposed to do as</p> <p>20 an investigative reporter, trying to dig up some stuff</p> <p>21 and making news headlines.</p> <p>22 Q Sure. And you said in the next to the last paragraph,</p> <p>23 "While I'm not anyone's attorney but Mark Owens, my</p> <p>24 general advice is ignore Mr. Hosenball and neither</p> <p>25 confirm or deny the author's name."</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">145</p> <p>1 I will tell you it has number 28 up at the top, and</p> <p>2 that is my writing that was not on the original</p> <p>3 document.</p> <p>4 (Exhibit 55</p> <p>5 marked for identification.)</p> <p>6 Q Do you remember Exhibit No. 55?</p> <p>7 A I do, because I think the first sentence captures</p> <p>8 Elyse Cheney's personality just about as good as you</p> <p>9 can. Hyper, over the top, emergency, urgency. It's</p> <p>10 the -- I think literally her voicemail was, "We're</p> <p>11 fighting for our survival" or words to that effect.</p> <p>12 And it was only a reaction to some news reporter's</p> <p>13 statement that -- yeah, this Julie Bosenman's statement</p> <p>14 that the Pentagon spokesman said they believed the</p> <p>15 book violated Department regulations.</p> <p>16 Q And that spokesman said it should have been reviewed</p> <p>17 prior to release?</p> <p>18 A I think that's what it says here. I haven't read it</p> <p>19 fully.</p> <p>20 (Exhibit 56</p> <p>21 marked for identification.)</p> <p>22 Q I've handed you an email string marked as Exhibit 56,</p> <p>23 two-page document. Second page just has a portion of</p> <p>24 your address, but there is an email from you where you</p> <p>25 say, "Did Kevin Maurer deliver the books to JS*C" and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">144</p> <p>1 A Yeah, because this guy was wanting to release Matt's</p> <p>2 name, and it had not been released by the publisher or</p> <p>3 anyone. I think what happened is someone from his</p> <p>4 former unit had talked to somebody at Fox and had</p> <p>5 slipped his name out that way.</p> <p>6 By this time, I knew Matt's real name, because</p> <p>7 that was in connection with forming the double-blind</p> <p>8 LLC, that he said his attorney in Virginia had formed</p> <p>9 a company for him, and that's where he was going to</p> <p>10 send his receipts, his royalties from the book. And I</p> <p>11 said, "Well, if you want to maintain anonymity, you've</p> <p>12 got to make sure that it's done properly. Can I</p> <p>13 check? What's the name of your business?" And I</p> <p>14 think he said "Chief Consulting," and it wasn't 20</p> <p>15 minutes later that I knew his name, his wife's name</p> <p>16 and where they lived. And so he agreed to allow us to</p> <p>17 set up a double-blind LLC for him.</p> <p>18 Q And then the last thing you say is, "Once the book is</p> <p>19 read, all of this will blow over."</p> <p>20 A Meaning once the book was published and people read</p> <p>21 it, they would see there was more in Nick Schmidle's</p> <p>22 article than there is in that book as far as detail</p> <p>23 and information goes. It's just his perspective from</p> <p>24 an Operator.</p> <p>25 Q Let me show you what is marked as Exhibit No. 55. And</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">146</p> <p>1 some other shorthand, and that's dated August 25. Do</p> <p>2 you remember sending that email asking if Kevin Maurer</p> <p>3 had delivered books?</p> <p>4 A I don't have any independent recollection of it.</p> <p>5 Q And then there is an email reply from Mark at 8:45.</p> <p>6 Yours is 6:28 a.m., so presumably his is 8:45 a.m.,</p> <p>7 although it doesn't say so. And he replies, "Sure</p> <p>8 did! They have all received and are reading it at</p> <p>9 this time. One book went to CIA. We're hoping to</p> <p>10 hear from them at some point today.</p> <p>11 "I'll keep you posted. Obviously we are hoping</p> <p>12 for zero issues and to simply be left alone. Thanks</p> <p>13 again for the hard work and help."</p> <p>14 Do you recall getting that from Mr. Bissonnette?</p> <p>15 A I don't have an independent memory of that.</p> <p>16 Q And then there's a reply from you to him where you</p> <p>17 say, "Good call to give the agency a copy."</p> <p>18 Why did you think it was a good call to give the</p> <p>19 agency a copy?</p> <p>20 A As I sit here, I don't recall why I said that.</p> <p>21 Q Then you continue, "I am pretty confident that once</p> <p>22 they read it everyone will calm down. I still think</p> <p>23 it's a good call for us not to have submitted the book</p> <p>24 to them. They probably would have told you none of it</p> <p>25 was classified."</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p>1 accurately describe for you Mr. Bissonnette's status 2 with the military, would you?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q So again --</p> <p>5 A But she did cause some concern for me, and that --</p> <p>6 Q That I accept. But my question again is this could --</p> <p>7 one could say this is research that should have been</p> <p>8 done before the advice about whether he was required</p> <p>9 to submit to a pre-publication review, and it's being</p> <p>10 done after the book is already printed.</p> <p>11 A That's if you didn't know what his status was. But</p> <p>12 she brought this up in August, that he was retired, in</p> <p>13 some cryptic way, and I wanted to cover all the bases.</p> <p>14 It had nothing to do with my understanding prior to</p> <p>15 that date. This is really the first time that I</p> <p>16 became aware that she was using that terminology, from</p> <p>17 what I remember.</p> <p>18 (Exhibit 60</p> <p>19 marked for identification.)</p> <p>20 Q Let me show you Exhibit 60, which is a series of</p> <p>21 emails, and let's start on the last page of the</p> <p>22 document and come forward.</p> <p>23 There's an email, on which you are not copied,</p> <p>24 from Italie Hillel to Christine Ball that says,</p> <p>25 "Christine, we're running story on Defense Department</p>	<p>151</p> <p>1 Do you see that?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Do you recall asking her whether Mark was in the</p> <p>4 Reserves?</p> <p>5 A Yeah, I wanted to make sure again, since she had sent</p> <p>6 me off on -- about the retired thing, I wanted to make</p> <p>7 sure he was not in the Reserves.</p> <p>8 Q Is there some reason you did not know whether he was</p> <p>9 in Reserves as of August 27?</p> <p>10 A He never gave me the DD Form 214 that he told me he</p> <p>11 was going to give me. He never gave me any of the</p> <p>12 discharge paperwork; so at that point, I didn't know</p> <p>13 what his status was. I started to get a little</p> <p>14 concerned that he had some Reserve obligation; because</p> <p>15 if he had a Reserve obligation, then he would fall</p> <p>16 under the regulations for -- the active duty</p> <p>17 regulations -- excuse me. You have to look at the DoD</p> <p>18 directive, but in there there's an applicability</p> <p>19 paragraph that says whether or not this regulation</p> <p>20 pertains to Reserve and National Guard, and likely he</p> <p>21 would have had some further obligation to submit if he</p> <p>22 was in the Reserves.</p> <p>23 And that's why I was asking the question, because</p> <p>24 Ms. Cheney said a couple of things, and I just wanted</p> <p>25 to make sure he was not in the Reserves at that point.</p>	<p>153</p> <p>152</p> <p>1 checking book. Do you guys have comment?"</p> <p>2 And then the next one is from Ms. Hillel to</p> <p>3 Christine Ball, "We ran the following this afternoon."</p> <p>4 And then there is a reference to the story that</p> <p>5 the AP ran.</p> <p>6 And then in the middle of that second page, there</p> <p>7 is an email from Ms. Cheney to Mr. Owen and to you,</p> <p>8 dated August 27, 3:54 p.m.; do you see that one?</p> <p>9 A I'm sorry. Tell me the date/time group again?</p> <p>10 Q August 27, 3:54 p.m., middle of the page.</p> <p>11 A All right.</p> <p>12 Q Find that?</p> <p>13 A Yes, from Cheney?</p> <p>14 Q Yes, and do you see that you were one of the</p> <p>15 recipients of that?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q And then she says, "See, why can't we give them the</p> <p>18 actual information so they get it right -- which is</p> <p>19 that he had an obligation not to publish classified</p> <p>20 info, but no obligation to go through the vetting</p> <p>21 process, as he says in point four. I mean, can't we</p> <p>22 agree that on background?"</p> <p>23 And then you replied to that about -- what is it,</p> <p>24 about 10 minutes later, to Ms. Cheney only, where you</p> <p>25 say, "Mark is not in Reserves, right?"</p>	<p>154</p> <p>1 Q Because you didn't know what his actual status was?</p> <p>2 A Well, my understanding was that he was off of active</p> <p>3 duty as of February 1st, 2012, but never got the</p> <p>4 documents from him and he never provided them to me,</p> <p>5 so --</p> <p>6 Q And without knowing whether he was in the Reserves or</p> <p>7 not, you advised him he had no pre-publication review</p> <p>8 obligation?</p> <p>9 A Yeah, I don't like your question, because it doesn't</p> <p>10 fairly encompass the context.</p> <p>11 Q Did you know he was not in the Reserves?</p> <p>12 A I strongly believed he was not, based on my previous</p> <p>13 conversations with him; but as I said, he failed to</p> <p>14 give me the discharge certificate, so I wasn't 100</p> <p>15 percent sure.</p> <p>16 Q And not being 100 percent sure, you advised him he had</p> <p>17 no pre-publication review obligation?</p> <p>18 MR. FURMAN: Objection.</p> <p>19 A No, that's not the only reason.</p> <p>20 MR. FURMAN: I think it's mischaracterizing the</p> <p>21 testimony.</p> <p>22 But you can answer.</p> <p>23 A That's not the only reason.</p> <p>24 Q I know it's not the only reason, but is it accurate</p> <p>25 that, number one, you didn't know if he was in the</p>
<p>1 Dickman Davenport, Inc</p> <p>2 214.855.5100 www.dickmandavenport.com 800.445.9548</p>			

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

155	157
1 Reserves; and not knowing, you advised him he had no 2 pre-publication review obligation? 3 A Not when you put it that way. You're wrong. So I 4 already answered your question. 5 Q On the first page of the document, August 27 at 4:16 6 p.m., you have an email to Ms. Cheney that says at the 7 end of the first paragraph, "If Mark was still in the 8 Reserves it may be a different story if the book 9 contained classified, but it does not. So, in any 10 event no worries." Correct? 11 A That's what it says. 12 Q And then you say, next paragraph, one sentence, "Mark 13 just texted me back and said he is not in Reserve." 14 Is that when you learned for the first time that Mark 15 was not in the Reserves? 16 A That's when Mark confirmed he was not in the Reserves. 17 That's not the first time, because, like I said, 18 before that time, my belief was he was not in the 19 Reserves based on our previous conversations. 20 Q Is it true that your email to Ms. Cheney on page 2 21 where you say, "Mark is NOT in the Reserves, right?" 22 is the first place -- is the first time you attempted 23 to confirm your belief that he was not in the 24 Reserves? 25 A No. I previously had done that with Mark when I had a	1 do think we should give Kevin's name in conjunction 2 with this." 3 Were you in agreement with them giving your name 4 out? 5 A I don't have any independent recollection of this 6 email. 7 Q Second paragraph, "The premise for any potential 8 concern of Government agencies over the book is the 9 supposition that the book contains classified 10 information or any facts that might put any of his 11 fellow personnel in any jeopardy. The author was very 12 mindful of this when working on the book and we are 13 very confident that we were successful. 14 "As the author" -- let me back up. They are 15 saying, "Can everyone look at the below that Peter 16 drafted, especially Kevin" -- and I think that's Kevin 17 Podlaski, because I don't see Kevin Maurer copied -- 18 oh, Kevin Maurer is also copied. "Especially Kevin 19 and let me know if you think it's okay". 20 And then they say, "The premise is it contains 21 confidential information. The author was mindful of 22 this. As the author of No Easy Day was discharged 23 from the military at the time he wrote the manuscript, 24 he was not required or compelled by any US law to 25 submit it to any military or government agency before
156	158

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p>163</p> <p>1 "Because the book contained no classified 2 information." Is it a true statement that on the date 3 of this email, it continued to be your opinion that 4 the book contained no classified information?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And subject only to the small or minor issues that 7 Mr. Bissonnette talked about, that continues to be 8 your belief today?</p> <p>9 A Asked and answered.</p> <p>10 Q Agreed. Sustained.</p> <p>11 (Exhibit 64 12 marked for identification.)</p> <p>13 Q This is a continuation of the email string that is 14 marked as -- I'm sorry. Let me rephrase. 15 Exhibit 64 is a continuation of the email string 16 that was marked as 63, where you said you would rather 17 not have your name published. If you look on page 2, 18 above your email is a reply from Ben Sevier where he 19 says, "Our attorneys are not comfortable with us 20 issuing any statement regarding legal issues without 21 their approval, and they need time to consider and 22 approve the release. Kevin Podlaski, in the interest 23 of making that happen as soon as possible, I'd like to 24 get you on the phone with Alex Gigante, our in-house 25 counsel with whom you have spoken in the past, and two</p>	<p>165</p> <p>1 A Um-hum.</p> <p>2 Q Did you voice any objection or propose any 3 modifications to the statement after receipt of this 4 email?</p> <p>5 A I'm sorry. I don't recall.</p> <p>6 Q Just so you appreciate my concern for your time, I 7 want you to know I've not marked an email from 8 Ms. Cheney to you that consists of "WTF".</p> <p>9 A With three exclamation points behind it?</p> <p>10 Q I didn't notice, but maybe.</p> <p>11 A That does capture the essence of her personality. (Exhibit 65 12 marked for identification.)</p> <p>13 Q Mr. Podlaski, I've handed you what I've marked as 14 Exhibit 65, which is a three-page document. If we go 15 back to the second page, there is at the bottom of the 16 second page an email from you to Mr. Podlaski where 17 you said, "Mark, Elyse sent me the article by Justin 18 Fishel." And there's the reference to, "As you 19 predicted, SOCOM 3 ft hover." What does a "3 ft 20 hover" mean?</p> <p>21 A It means that people are so excited that they, you 22 know, lift themselves off the ground and put their 23 hands over their head and scream. So it's just a 24 figure of speech, of course.</p>
<p>164</p> <p>1 attorneys with whom he is working with." 2 Did that phone call take place?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. There's a reply from you, "Okay Ben. I'll be 5 on the road tomorrow. Call my cell," and you give the 6 cell phone, correct?</p> <p>7 A Correct.</p> <p>8 Q And then there's a reply from Mr. Sevier to you that 9 starts on page 1 and goes on to page 2, talking about 10 who you'll be talking with, and it says, "They've 11 joined our team late, so need background. I've shared 12 your email yesterday giving them a baseline." 13 And then above that there's an email from you 14 following the phone call, correct?</p> <p>15 A Correct.</p> <p>16 Q Where you say, "I spoke with Dean and Susan. I 17 understand they've written a mutually agreeable public 18 statement. If possible, I would like a copy of it." 19 And then the rest of it, of the email on page 1, is 20 from Mr. Sevier to you, "Here's what we shared. The 21 story is live on NYT."</p> <p>22 Is that New York Times?</p> <p>23 A I have no idea.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. "Right now." And then there is the statement 25 that they proposed releasing, correct?</p>	<p>166</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And then you say to him, "As you also 2 predicted, once the book is out and they read it, 3 everyone will calm down." 4 And then you quote Tom Petty, correct?</p> <p>5 A That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q And then he replies, "Thanks brother. Appreciate all 7 the help." 8 And then the next email is another one from you 9 where you report, "In a three way phone call with 10 Elyse, me, and Kevin Maurer 50 minutes ago, Maurer 11 said he gave my name to USSOCOM." 12 And then you say, "Number 1, if I talk to them 13 they will have to call me. I'm not calling them." 14 "2, if they call I'm only going to say I vetted 15 the manuscript. Minimal changes were required. That 16 is, there was no mention of sensitive matters." 17 And that's what you were prepared to say if SOCOM 18 called you, correct?</p> <p>19 A Correct.</p> <p>20 Q And did they call?</p> <p>21 A They never called.</p> <p>22 Q And then above that is an email from you to Mr. Owen?</p> <p>23 A Yeah.</p> <p>24 Q It's another one where it's an email from you to you 25 with a copy to him, presumably so you could preserve</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	167		169
1	it for yourself somehow. But you say, "Need to know	1	Q And indicated a desire to help him if he was?
2	whether op Neptune was a compartmentalized operation.	2	A Right. That's because I came across this -- you can
3	If so, did you sign a sensitive compartmented	3	see the hyperlink in there, that Spielberg talks to
4	information non-disclosure agreement before that op?"	4	ex-Navy SEAL, and that indicated that he was in talks
5	Why are you asking him on August the 28th whether	5	with Spielberg about releasing the movie -- or making
6	Operation Neptune Spear was a compartmented operation?	6	a movie from his book.
7	A Once again, Elizabeth Cheney -- excuse me, Elyse	7	Q So is this hyperlink on Spielberg is Spielberg talks
8	Cheney -- I've called her everything but her real name	8	to Matthew Bissonnette?
9	now. Elyse Cheney was just freaking out, and I just	9	A I don't know if it said Matthew Bissonnette. I don't
10	wanted to nail down all the possibilities one more	10	recall. It just said a Navy SEAL.
11	time once -- and I think something in -- it wasn't	11	Q Okay. And you assumed it was him?
12	Hosenball, but it was a guy from -- another National	12	A Yeah, that's what I did. And then he responded, "Not
13	Security Correspondent made mention of the sensitive	13	selling!" And then he kind of put that to rest with
14	nature of the compartment -- excuse me -- of the	14	"SS" -- whoever that is, I don't know who that is --
15	operation, and that just -- wanted to make sure one	15	"should have put out a statement saying that was false
16	more time with Mark that there was -- that he had not	16	as well."
17	signed any document and it was not SAP.	17	MR. JOHNSTON: Okay. Let's take a 5 or 10-minute
18	Don't forget now, we just had advanced copies put	18	break and let me organize the rest of these documents
19	out, and so the people who you would give to the	19	and see how fast we can go through them.
20	Office of Security and Policy Review, they would send	20	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
21	it to these people anyway, and here they've got copies	21	(Recess)
22	of the book. So before the national release, these	22	(Exhibit 67
23	people have a copy of these books.	23	marked for identification.)
24	So, effectively there was a vetting done by these	24	BY MR. JOHNSTON:
25	people before it was made national and released	25	Q Mr. Podlaski, I've handed you what's marked as Exhibit
	168		170
1	nationally, but, you know, this would represent the	1	67, which appears to be an email exchange between you
2	last clear chance to put the brakes on and submit the	2	and Mr. Bissonnette, dated August 30, concerning the
3	book, had Mark said, "Yeah, it was an SEI Special	3	60 Minutes interview. Do you remember this exchange?
4	Access mission." And at that point I would have said,	4	A I don't have any independent recollection of it. I'm
5	"Whoa, we need to submit the book formally." Even	5	sorry.
6	though everybody who would have gotten the book	6	Q Do you remember being involved in the discussion of
7	already got the book, you still have to check that	7	the 60 Minutes interview on the "No Easy Day"?
8	block and do it their way. But I don't even know if	8	A You know, I think there was something circulated about
9	he ever answered this.	9	it, but I really can't recall how much.
10	Q Let me show you Exhibit 66.	10	(Exhibit 68
11	(Exhibit 66	11	marked for identification.)
12	marked for identification.)	12	Q Let me show you what's marked as Exhibit 68, another
13	Q In the middle of the first page of this is an email	13	email exchange, dated August 30. And if you go back
14	from you to Mr. Bissonnette and then a reply from him,	14	to the next to the last page, there's an email from
15	and then another reply from him, correct?	15	Christine Ball saying, "The AP article just ran."
16	A Let's see. It appears that there is at least two,	16	And then Mark Fabiani replied, saying, "Awesome
17	maybe three, emails in here. I think there's three	17	read!!! Perfect. Great work."
18	emails in here.	18	And then another one from Elyse Cheney -- well,
19	Q Correct. So the first one in time --	19	Mr. Ragone has one, "Great work on all."
20	A There's four, yeah. Go ahead. I'm sorry.	20	And then Elyse Cheney, "Guys, how can we get Joby
21	Q That's okay. The first one in time from you, August	21	Warrick's article in which he said Mike had no
22	29, 2012 at 10:25 a.m., you wrote him and asked	22	obligation to send the manuscript to DoD out there in
23	whether he was going to make a movie from the book,	23	a big way? Joby is highly respected journalist."
24	correct?	24	And then Mark Fabiani replies, "We're getting
25	A Um-hum.	25	serious push back from Government. They all say, at

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	171		173
1 least according to Hosenball, that Mark had signed a 2 contract that obligated him to do pre-clear even after 3 retired." 4 And then there's an Elyse Cheney email to you. 5 "Kevin, can you chime in here? Fabiani, do you think 6 we should deploy Kevin P on background so he can quote 7 our argument?" 8 Mark Fabiani, "I think the story has moved past 9 the pre-clearance issue at this point so it might not 10 make sense." 11 Do you remember getting -- being involved in this 12 string of emails discussing this? 13 A I don't have any independent recollection of it. 14 Q Okay. Then on August 30th, page 1, there's an email 15 from you, replying to the group. "If you want to 16 respond to Hosenball I recommend only asking him what 17 is the authority for his position. That is, 18 specifically; what Govt form, statute, Executive 19 Order, or regulation is he referring when he claims 20 author signed a contract obligating him to pre-clear." 21 Do you remember advising the group that if they 22 were going to respond, it should be limited to that 23 type of response? 24 A No, but this "even after retired," that language 25 apparently was to Hosenball. Maybe that was why Elyse	1 were, based on what I have said previously, based on 2 my experience, based on my review of Standard Form 3 312, based on my review of DD Form 1847-1, which he 4 said he never signed and didn't recall being briefed 5 on. So, you know, you're trying to turn this thing on 6 its head. 7 But my thing to Hosenball was, "Hey, you tell me, 8 Mr. Hosenball, why you think he had an obligation." 9 And if he would have said he signed a DD Form 1847-1 10 in connection with Operation Neptune Spear, I would 11 have said, "Show me." 12 And if he would have showed me, then I would have 13 said, "By golly, you're right." 14 If he would have shown me that he was still on 15 active duty then, I would have said "that DoD 16 regulation applies and, therefore, you're right, when 17 he wrote the book or had it in some form prior to 18 being released from active duty -- had it in some 19 written form prior to being released from active 20 duty." 21 Q And I get it. I don't care about Mr. Hosenball at 22 all. My question was, did you do any legal research 23 prior to your advice to Mr. Bissonnette with regard to 24 whether he had a pre-publication review obligation? 25 A Yes.		
	172		174
1 Cheney was talking to me about retired things; I don't 2 know. But in any event, no, I don't have an 3 independent recollection of any of this, except I knew 4 that Hosenball -- I felt he was a blind rhinoceros 5 running around trying to trample people. 6 Q Let me ask you the question that you proposed they ask 7 Hosenball with regard to your conclusion that there 8 was no obligation to do a pre-publication review of 9 the book. What is the authority in the form of 10 statute or Executive Order or DoD regulation on which 11 you relied to reach the conclusion that there was no 12 pre-publication review obligation? 13 A We've addressed this several times. 14 Q Yeah, and let me modify my question, because we've 15 talked about the factual stuff, and I don't -- you 16 don't need to tell me factually, "Mark said this, I 17 heard that." 18 A Okay. 19 Q Et cetera. Is there any legal research that you did 20 prior to advising Mr. Bissonnette that he did not have 21 a pre-publication review obligation? 22 A Well, first off, you're coming to that conclusion, and 23 I'm not going to necessarily adopt your conclusion 24 that I advised him he didn't have to have a 25 pre-publication review. I told him what the options	1 Q And is that reflected in legal memoranda or copies of 2 cases or anything? Because I have not seen anything 3 out of your file before the August 27 request for a 4 memo that we marked earlier. 5 A Right, and as I said to you previously, I spoke with 6 Mark Owen and -- 7 Q Not legal research. I'm only asking about legal 8 research. 9 A Do you want me to answer your question or not? I'm 10 trying to answer your question. 11 Q If it's legal research, I want to hear about it. You 12 don't have to repeat what you've told me before. 13 A Well, with everything that I've said as precedence, 14 let me tell you that the legal research I did I have 15 done in previous matters and in connection with 16 Mr. Bissonnette's book. Is there a writing to that 17 effect? No. 18 Q Okay. Are you telling me that in connection with your 19 advice to Mr. Bissonnette and your analysis of his 20 situation, you relied on legal research you had done 21 for other authors on other occasions? 22 A I will say that I relied on legal research I had done 23 previously. 24 Q Okay. Did you do any research specifically on his 25 situation?		

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	175		177
1	MR. FURMAN: When you say "research," I'm not	1	signed by the author" -- and then capital letters --
2	sure if I understand what you mean.	2	"DID NOT require him to first send the book to the
3	Q Legal research.	3	Govt for review/vetting UNLESS" -- capital letters --
4	A What do you mean by "his situation"?	4	"he thought classified information was contained in
5	Q I mean from -- I'll give you a time frame. From	5	the writing. Since we were and are sure it did
6	January 1, 2012 to the end of February 2012, did you	6	not" -- let me stop you there.
7	do any legal research with regard to Mr. Bissonnette's	7	What do you mean by "sure it did not"? Does that
8	need to know whether he had a pre-publication review?	8	mean since we are sure and were sure that the book did
9	A What legal research are you referring to?	9	not contain classified information?
10	Q Respectfully, sir, you're a lawyer. You know what	10	A That's what I think it was referring to, yes.
11	legal research is, looking at statutes, looking at	11	Q "There was no obligation to let the Govt review it
12	cases, looking at regulations, Westlaw searches,	12	before it was published."
13	asking associates to do it for you, anything like	13	A That's right, and that should be referring to Standard
14	that.	14	Form 312, because that's the only document that he
15	MR. FURMAN: Does that also include drawing upon	15	could recall signing, and he would not let me contact
16	your own experience?	16	his security officer to get his current security
17	Q I just said from January 1 to February 30. No, it	17	status or his debriefing status.
18	doesn't include things you knew before January 1. Did	18	Q Now, having just read that language, let me ask you,
19	you do anything new from January 1 to the end of	19	because maybe I paraphrased it wrong earlier. Are you
20	February -- not 30 -- in connection with the retention	20	disputing that you told Mr. Bissonnette there was no
21	by Mr. Bissonnette?	21	obligation to let the Government review the book
22	A Yes. I believe that I printed out Standard Form 312	22	before it was published?
23	and I printed out DD Form 1847-1, reviewed them and	23	A I've --
24	discussed them with Mr. Bissonnette.	24	MR. FURMAN: That is asked and answered.
25	Q Okay. Anything else?	25	A I mean, read the transcript back for the answer. You
	176		178
1	A No, not that I can recall.	1	keep asking me the same question. I'm not going to
2	Q Let me show you what's marked as Exhibit -- do you	2	change my response.
3	have 68 in front of you still?	3	Q The only reason I'm asking the same question is
4	MR. FURMAN: We do.	4	because I sense you changing your answer. I asked
5	Q I'm going too fast here. On page 1 at the middle --	5	earlier about what research you did in connection with
6	well, towards the bottom of the page, there's an email	6	your advice that there was no obligation to submit to
7	from you dated August 30. Do you see that, where you	7	a pre-publication review, and you said, I thought,
8	say, "I recommend the questions to Mr. Hosenball," the	8	"Mr. Johnston, respectfully, I'm not going to adopt
9	one we just talked about?	9	your version of my advice." So now I'm reading your
10	MR. FURMAN: It's dated August 30th at 6:49 a.m.?	10	words. "Since we were and are sure it did not, there
11	MR. JOHNSTON: Correct.	11	was no obligation to let the Govt review it before it
12	A Okay.	12	was published."
13	Q And then above that, there is a reply by Mr. Fabiani,	13	A So within the context that I believe this to be a
14	saying, "He's claiming for what it's worth his	14	Standard Form 312, and if Mr. Bissonnette -- not "if,"
15	Government sources tell him" blah, blah, blah. And	15	because Mr. Bissonnette told me that that is the only
16	then above that is another email from you, dated	16	document he signed, the Standard Form 312, and told me
17	August 30 at 7:06 a.m. Do you see that?	17	he was not on active duty when he wrote it, and told
18	A Yes.	18	me that he was not told he was being given information
19	Q And then you say, "He is referring to a Non-Disclosure	19	from a Special Access Program and told me he did not
20	Agreement. However, importantly, there are several	20	sign a Special Access Program Non-Disclosure
21	types of Non-Disclosure Agreements published by the	21	Agreement, then that is an accurate statement.
22	government and there are important distinctions in	22	Q And in the course of your representation, you told him
23	each."	23	that there was no obligation to let the Government
24	And then the next paragraph, "We have every	24	review it before it was published?
25	reason to believe that the Non-Disclosure Agreement	25	A Asked and answered.

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	179		181
1	(Exhibit 69	1	the transmittal of the fax.
2	marked for identification.)	2	A Oh, that's right, because he's mentioning it here.
3	Q Exhibit 69 is a couple of emails dated August 30,	3	Q And you earlier indicated that you didn't know when
4	late, which deal with the Jeh Johnson letter, the	4	you got it. That makes it look like you got it before
5	bottom one. Ben Sevier is saying that he is putting	5	midnight the day it was sent, doesn't it?
6	in a drop box the 9-page fax from DoD, correct?	6	A Yeah, apparently so. I thought it was the next day,
7	A That's what it appears to be.	7	but I guess I wasn't sleeping when I got it.
8	Q And then the next one is from Mr. Bissonnette, saying,	8	(Exhibit 70
9	"Kevin P, from the looks of the docs, I apparently did	9	marked for identification.)
10	sign some sort of SAP program does."	10	Q Do you have Exhibit 70 there in front of you now?
11	Do you see that one as well?	11	A Yeah.
12	A Yeah, that's an email we examined previously.	12	Q If you go back to the third page, there is an email
13	Q Correct. And then there's an email from you up above,	13	from Ben Sevier to you, August 30 at 2:49 p.m.,
14	dated 11:43 p.m., just before midnight. You email him	14	"latest legal reporting". This would apparently be
15	and say, "In the book you mention 'white robe'.	15	before the Jeh Johnson letter was received. This
16	Wasn't that a SAP?"	16	says, "I wanted to draw your attention to the
17	MR. FURMAN: Is this marked as an exhibit?	17	following media reports. Less than definitive, but
18	(Pause)	18	certainly interesting."
19	A That's what it says there.	19	And then he has two cites, and then he says, "In
20	Q And then he replies, "And I wasn't on deployment in	20	light of the possibility of a lawsuit of either civil
21	January that I can remember."	21	or criminal court, do you think we should be doing
22	A Yeah, I don't have any idea what that means. It	22	anything to prepare? Do you still think the
23	doesn't seem to be responsive.	23	possibility is remote?"
24	Q It doesn't, but let me ask you this.	24	And then you send him a lengthy reply that begins
25	Is there some reason that on August 30 at some 17	25	on page 1, correct?
	180		182
1	minutes before midnight, you were asking for the first	1	A Yes.
2	time whether "white robe" was an SAP?	2	Q And among other things you say in your reply, "The
3	A No. That's your assessment, is for the first time.	3	book contains NO classified or classifiable
4	We had discussions, Mark and I, about that and what it	4	information."
5	meant, while I was reviewing the manuscript.	5	A Yeah, that seems to be what my opinion was at the
6	So my questioning him about that as an SAP was,	6	time.
7	once again, generated by the hyperbolic response of	7	Q And you say, "It's highly unlikely that Operation
8	Ms. Cheney who was freaking out over Hosenball's	8	Neptune was an SCI program."
9	questioning.	9	A Okay. Don't forget now, this is before Jeh Johnson's
10	So, once again, just trying to nail down issues.	10	letter, and this is based upon everything that
11	Q When did you discuss "white robe" with	11	Mr. Bissonnette had told me, and that he had not
12	Mr. Bissonnette? Is this in one of the phone calls	12	signed a form indicating that it was a DD Form 1847-1
13	we've already talked about?	13	that it was an SAP.
14	A Yeah, this is in a phone call in June after I got the	14	And then also I speak about here how these people
15	manuscript and read through it for the first time.	15	who were mentioned here, The President, Panetta and
16	Q Is this one of the same phone calls, the two calls	16	McRaven, they all have classification authority, they
17	we've already talked about in June, or is there	17	have declassification authority. And by virtue of
18	another phone call in June?	18	they're speaking about this on international
19	A No, that's one of the phone calls in June. And I	19	television, it could potentially declassify a Special
20	think this is -- gosh, I don't know. This is the	20	Access Program to a lesser-classified program. And
21	30th, so this must have been after the fax receipt of	21	that is certainly a defense that was available to
22	that letter perhaps.	22	Mr. Bissonnette and Mr. Luskin when they were dealing
23	Q It is.	23	with the Government, the fact that these gentlemen had
24	A Yeah.	24	already declassified it. And if it's not a Special
25	Q In fact, if you look at the bottom of the page, it's	25	Access Program, then there may not be an obligation to

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	183		
1	submit it. Moreover, you have to have an 1847-1	1	was not an SC Program at the operator level?
2	signed for the compartmented program that you're	2	A As of 4:01 p.m., yes.
3	working on. Or you should have.	3	Q Okay. And do you have that -- do you agree that that
4	Q On page 1 of your email and going over to page 2,	4	is true today with the additional knowledge you have
5	looking at the Paragraph 2a, you say, "As I told your	5	acquired since then?
6	retained counsel, the only way the book had to be	6	A I -- once again, I have to refer you to what the known
7	first reviewed was if Operation Neptune had been	7	facts are. So that would be an opinion of mine. And
8	designated as an SCIA, Sensitive Compartmented	8	the only opinion that counts is the Government's
9	Program" --	9	opinion.
10	A No, "Information or a Special Access Program".	10	Q Continuing on down to the middle of that second page
11	Q "Information", thank you. "Or Special Access	11	at subparagraph e. Do you see that?
12	Program." Do you still stand by that statement?	12	A Yes.
13	A Well, that statement demands a full explanation, once	13	Q And you say, "It is highly unlikely" -- with "highly
14	again, of all of the things that we've already	14	unlikely" underlined -- "that Operation Neptune was an
15	discussed in this matter. There's no -- the facts on	15	SCI program."
16	the table are there is no 1847-1 and there's no	16	And then there's a sentence that follows that.
17	affidavit linking Operation Neptune Spear to --	17	My question is, the sentence that follows it, is that
18	Q I'm going to object as non-responsive. I apologize	18	the basis for your statement, "It's unlikely that
19	for interrupting.	19	Operation Neptune was an SCI program? For example,
20	MR. FURMAN: No, no. It's not nonresponsive.	20	the President, Panetta and McRaven all talked about
21	MR. JOHNSTON: I'm asking a yes or no question.	21	it. That's an indication that it wasn't. Boale and
22	I only have two hours left, and I don't want to listen	22	Bigelow were given access."
23	to a lengthy paragraph when I have asked a yes or no	23	A No, sir, those are examples after that first sentence.
24	question. I object as non-responsive. He can say	24	Q Okay. All right.
25	"yes", "no", or "I can't answer". But the question	25	A Or examples of why it's unlikely; that and also
	184		
1	asks for "yes" or "no".	1	everything to do with what Mr. Bissonnette told me.
2	Q Do you stand by that statement?	2	Q And then in Paragraph 3(a), last sentence, you say,
3	MR. FURMAN: And the only way that Mr. Podlaski	3	"Because the author was retired at the time he wrote
4	can answer that question is by giving you the answer	4	the manuscript" --
5	based on his present knowledge.	5	A Where is that? 3(a)?
6	MR. JOHNSTON: He can say, "Yes, I do"; "no, I	6	Q 3(a).
7	don't."	7	A I thought it was -- 3(a) says "discharged" and then
8	MR. FURMAN: With all respect, I don't think he	8	down at the bottom -- yeah, I think that was a
9	can do that. But let's just --	9	mistyped.
10	MR. JOHNSTON: I have a finite amount of time.	10	Q So you're calling him "retired" as well, aren't you?
11	I've asked a simple question.	11	A I think that was a mistype, that's all it was.
12	Q Do you stand by the statement you type, "The only way	12	Q So you were critical of Ms. Cheney saying he was
13	the book had to be first reviewed by the govt was if	13	retired and then you did the same thing?
14	Operation Neptune Spear had been designated as a	14	A Well, Ms. Cheney did it multiple times. I just did it
15	Sensitive Compartmented Information Program or Special	15	once there. But the first sentence says he was
16	Access Program"?	16	discharged after 12 years. You can't be discharged
17	Do you agree with that statement?	17	after 12 years unless you're medically retired.
18	A I would -- it's not complete.	18	So I admit I made a typographical error.
19	Q The next sentence says, "All indications are that Op	19	Q And then on the last page of the document, back to
20	Neptune was NOT an SCI Program -- at least at the	20	the -- the full paragraph is not indented into the
21	operator's level."	21	sub-paragraph. You say, "Bottom line: There is
22	Do you agree with that statement today?	22	nothing classified in the book and Operation Neptune
23	Let me rephrase that.	23	was simply not an SCI SAP -- at least at the
24	Do you agree that the all indications that you	24	operator's level. The book reveals nothing new except
25	had available to you on August 30, 2012 were that it	25	Mark's personal observations." Correct?
	186		

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: right;">187</p> <p>1 A That's what it says. 2 Q Did you ever send Mr. Bissonnette an email or letter 3 that disagreed or departed from those conclusions, 4 nothing classified, Operation Neptune was not an SCI 5 or an SAP? 6 A I don't believe so. I don't recall, but I don't think 7 so. 8 Q If you had changed your mind about that, would you 9 think it appropriate to tell him? 10 A I think I would have a duty to tell him. 11 Q And you have not told him? 12 A I am no longer retained by Mr. Bissonnette. 13 Q I'm sorry? 14 A I'm no longer retained by Mr. Bissonnette. 15 Q So during the time you were representing him and had 16 that duty, you never told him? 17 A I think I already said that, yes. 18 Q Thank you. 19 (Exhibit 71 20 marked for identification) 21 Q Do you have Exhibit 71? 22 A Yes. 23 Q At the bottom of Exhibit 71, on the page 1, is an 24 email from Mr. Bissonnette to you and Ms. Cheney and 25 Mr. Luskin dated, August 31 at 10 a.m., the day after</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">189</p> <p>1 you need just give me a call or shoot me an email." 2 Correct? 3 A Yeah. 4 Q And then he replies, "Kevin, here's a draft. I'd like 5 you to take a look before it's circulated to the 6 larger group." 7 Do you know why he wanted you to look at it 8 before it was circulated to the larger group? 9 A I have no idea. 10 Q Would that be evidence to you that he was relying on 11 you in some fashion? 12 A I don't know what he thought. 13 Q Is it your contention in this lawsuit that he should 14 not have defended your prior conclusions that there 15 was not a pre-publication review obligation? 16 MR. FURMAN: Objection. 17 A I'm sorry? 18 MR. FURMAN: I'm having trouble with the 19 "contention" aspect of your -- 20 MR. JOHNSTON: Do you want me to read the email 21 again where he says there's not a pre-publication 22 review obligation sent two days earlier? 23 MR. FURMAN: I'm noting my objection to the form 24 of the question. 25 MR. JOHNSTON: Fine.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">188</p> <p>1 the Jeh Johnson letter was received, correct? 2 A Yeah, that's what it appears to be, yes. 3 Q When you -- did you get this email? 4 A Yeah, I recall getting this email. 5 Q Where it says, "I'd love to get the Mark Owen team 6 together really quick and talk"? 7 A Yeah. 8 Q Was this the first time you had heard the name of 9 Mr. Luskin? 10 A I don't -- I don't recall, as I sit here. I thought 11 it was on the 30th that I heard Luskin's name, that he 12 was hired and that this was going to occur the next 13 day. As a matter of fact, I think he called me on the 14 30th, saying he was just hired. 15 Q Is that -- is it your testimony that he called you on 16 the 30th and that's when he told you, "Don't talk to 17 my client anymore"? 18 A I'm pretty sure it was the 30th, yeah. That's what I 19 remember. 20 Q To be more accurate and fair to you, what you said 21 was, "Don't talk to my client unless I'm there," or 22 something like that? 23 A "Unless I'm present," yeah. 24 Q Okay. There is an email from you, replying to 25 Mr. Luskin, saying, "Bob, if there is anything else</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">190</p> <p>1 A In answer to your question, I think that Mr. Luskin 2 had an obligation and a duty to make his own 3 assessment. 4 Q Are you critical of him for defending your conclusions 5 and recommendations? 6 MR. FURMAN: Objection. 7 A I'm neither here nor there on that. I'm critical of 8 him not putting up a fight on tendering the royalties. 9 Q So your criticism of him is the settlement? 10 A Well, it appears that they laid down instead of 11 defending what Mr. Luskin clearly believed. 12 Q I understand. And I'm not trying to take that away 13 from you. I understood that from your earlier 14 testimony. That's your criticism of him? 15 A Yeah. 16 Q Okay. 17 (Exhibit 72 18 marked for identification.) 19 Q I'm going to try to go through some of these fast, 20 because there's only small portions of them that I'm 21 interested in. 22 Exhibit 72, the second email from the top is an 23 email -- well, let's go down. The third one is, 24 "Kevin, here's a draft. I'd like you to take a look 25 at it."</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: right;">191</p> <p>1 It's a copy of the other one. And then there's 2 your reply, "Bob, I like it. However instead of 3 saying 'by this undertaking', in quotes, "I recommend 4 saying," in quotes, "by the Non-Disclosure Agreement 5 you have identified," closed quotes. 6 Do you remember making that recommended change to 7 Mr. Luskin? 8 A I have no independent recollection of it. 9 Q And then he says, "Good suggestion. I'll incorporate 10 and circulate." Correct? 11 A That's what he says. 12 Q And did he make that change? 13 A I don't recall. 14 (Exhibit 73 15 marked for identification.) 16 Q There's not much on here I want to talk about. At the 17 top of the page is an email from Mr. Sevier to 18 everyone conceivably on the team, including you, 19 correct? 20 MR. FURMAN: Objection to the reference to the 21 team. That's -- 22 Q Did you have an understanding of what Mr. Bissonnette 23 meant when he said, "I'd like to get a meeting of the 24 team"? 25 A Yeah, I think that he meant everybody that was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">193</p> <p>1 for being faxed a copy of the Johnson reply, correct? 2 A That's what it says, yes. 3 (Exhibit 75 4 marked for identification.) 5 Q Exhibit 75 is a series of three short emails, the 6 first one August 31 at 7:11 p.m. from you to 7 Ms. Cheney. Do you see that one? 8 A Yes. 9 Q You initiated this inquiry to her, correct, as opposed 10 to her initiating it to you? 11 A Yes. 12 Q And you said, "Things calm down?" 13 A I asked the question. 14 Q And then her reply, "I haven't heard anything which I 15 guess is a good thing," to which you reply, "Good." 16 A That's what it says. 17 Q Would that communication be inconsistent with the 18 directions that you indicated you had received from 19 Mr. Luskin about not contacting his client unless he 20 was there? 21 A Yeah, but this was to Ms. Cheney. 22 Q I know, and my question was did you consider that his 23 directions to you in the phone call you've testified 24 about -- which I understand he disputes, but I'll 25 leave that to y'all to work out -- that it did not</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">192</p> <p>1 involved with the book on both -- including myself and 2 publication people, their marketing people as well, 3 which is obvious from here, the head of the team, Bob 4 Luskin. 5 Q Okay. 6 (Exhibit 74 7 marked for identification.) 8 Q 74 is an email chain, still dated August 31. I want 9 to direct your attention first to the first page. The 10 very middle is an email from Ben Sevier to the team. 11 Do you see that? 12 A Yeah. 13 Q And you're one of the members there, you're one of the 14 persons copied on it. 15 A I see that. 16 Q And then he says, "The publisher's priority is to get 17 that strong letter out ASAP. I can join a call if we 18 need to discuss, but we have no further updates except 19 to execute the strategy we agreed on this morning." 20 Do you recall a phone call or meeting where there 21 was a strategy agreed upon the morning of August 31? 22 A As I sit here, I can't recall. I have no independent 23 recollection. 24 Q Then at the very top there is an email from you to 25 Mr. Luskin and Mr. Owen where you're saying thank you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">194</p> <p>1 include you communicating with Ms. Cheney? You were 2 still free to do that? 3 A Yeah, that was my understanding. I mean, since she 4 was the voice piece of the emotional concern, just 5 wanted to see if she had calmed down. 6 (Exhibit 76 7 marked for identification.) 8 Q In Exhibit (sic) 2174, there is a couple of emails 9 relevant to or referencing the reply to Mr. Johnson, 10 and then on page 1 there is an email from Mr. Luskin, 11 of August 31 at 12:04, where he is replying to the 12 earlier email we talked about from Sevier where he 13 says, "I agree there's not much to talk about. The 14 letter is being prepared now. I'll review the final 15 draft and plan to get it on its way w/in the hour." 16 And then you replied to him and only -- well, him 17 and Mr. Owen but not the whole team, and you just 18 asked, "Major changes?" 19 A Just to correct you, I just reply to him. I don't 20 think there's -- 21 Q Oh, you're correct. I saw "Subject: Mark Owen". 22 That's not a "cc Mark Owen". You replied just to him, 23 lawyer to lawyer, basically saying were there any 24 major changes made to the letter, correct? 25 A Correct.</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p>1 Q And then he says, "Trivial," and it's being prepared 2 in final, correct? 3 A Correct. 4 Q So he was keeping you informed along the way of what 5 he was going to do in response to the Jeh Johnson 6 letter? 7 A Yeah, he was, as well as other persons were including 8 me in the email chain. 9 (Exhibit 77 10 marked for identification.) 11 Q Exhibit 77 is a couple of emails again, starting with 12 the one from you August 31, 1221 (sic) at 11:57 a.m.; 13 do you see that one? 14 A Yes. 15 Q It says, "I wonder if the reason the DoD is pushing 16 this at the direction of the White House could be in 17 response to the comments about the POTUS and the 18 VEEP". 19 Do you remember sending that email with that 20 musing or inquiry in your mind? 21 A I don't have any independent recollection. 22 Q Who is that sent to? 23 A I don't recall. 24 Q Who replied to it? 25 A It's kind of difficult to tell from this, but it</p>	<p>195</p> <p>1 Q In any event, it is a communication directly to Mr. 2 Owen from you -- his reply directly to you and your 3 reply directly to him about the subject matter of the 4 Government's treatment of "No Easy Day"?</p> <p>5 A Well, that's your characterization of it. 6 Q Do you disagree with that characterization? 7 A Like I said, it's my conveying to Mark Owen the 8 thoughts of a fellow military author. 9 (Exhibit 78 10 marked for identification.) 11 A And moreover, it's not really talking about him in 12 particular. It's talking about what the impetus for 13 the DoD letter is. So -- 14 Q I've just handed you Exhibit 78, but I don't remember 15 why, so just set it down and we'll move on. 16 A I think we've all done that at one point or another. 17 Q Yeah. 18 (Exhibit 79 19 marked for identification.) 20 Q I've handed you Exhibit 79. Do you recognize that as 21 an email dated August 30 to Mark Owen from you? 22 A No. This is an email from me to me, Subject: Mark 23 Owen. 24 Q You know you're right again. I thought you forwarded 25 it to Mark. You're correct.</p>
<p>196</p> <p>1 appears that Mark Owen replied. 2 Q And then what's the top one that's replying to the 3 Mark Owen reply? 4 A Well, what do you mean? It looks like a reply to Mark 5 Owen's response. 6 Q From you? 7 A Yeah. 8 Q And it has a reference subject, "Dalton Fury 9 thoughts." 10 A Oh, okay. Yeah, I do recall this. Yeah, I got an 11 email from a client who -- Dalton Fury, who I passed 12 that along. That was his comments. 13 Q So if Mr. Luskin had ordered you not to have 14 discussions with Mr. Bissonnette without his 15 participation, you violated those discussions on two 16 occasions in Exhibit 77, didn't you? 17 A Yeah, but it appears we were just conveying what 18 another author had said. 19 Q Well, the first one is not conveying what another 20 author was saying, is it? 21 A Yeah. "I wonder if the reason" -- that was from -- 22 I'm pretty sure that was from Dalton Fury. 23 Q So he was wondering and you said you were wondering? 24 A He said he was wondering and I forwarded it. It's 25 under -- "Dalton Fury thoughts" is the Subject.</p>	<p>198</p> <p>1 A No, this is just a note I made to myself. 2 Q Yep. You're right. 3 (Exhibit 80 4 marked for identification.) 5 Q You have Exhibit 80 in front of you? 6 A I do. 7 Q Do you recall sending this email to Mr. Owen? 8 A I have no independent recollection on it. 9 Q What is the subject line of the email? 10 A It says, "Attorney client privileges communication and 11 attorney work product." 12 Q And it's dated September 4 at 9:46 a.m.? 13 A Right. 14 Q And it just has the question, "How are you feeling 15 today," correct? 16 A Yeah. I just can't see how that can be 17 attorney-client protected but okay. I don't know. 18 That's what it says. 19 Q And this is, again, you communicating directly with 20 Mr. Owen after you say Mr. Luskin told you not to talk 21 to Mr. Owen unless he was present? 22 A Yeah, I think the implication was about the book, but 23 that doesn't seem to be about the book. 24 Q Why were you concerned about how he felt -- or 25 interested in how he felt on that day?</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p>1 A Just an attorney inquiring with his client after a 2 rather tumultuous few days of media reaction.</p> <p>3 Q So the source of your concern with regard to how he 4 felt is the subject of the representation, the trouble 5 the book was in?</p> <p>6 A No, not really. I just wanted to see how he was 7 handling it at a personal level. I may be an 8 attorney, but I'm not heartless.</p> <p>9 (Exhibit 81 10 marked for identification.)</p> <p>11 Q Do you have Exhibit 81 in front of you?</p> <p>12 A I do.</p> <p>13 Q The first page of the exhibit at the top is an email 14 from Elyse Cheney to you, dated September 4; do you 15 see that?</p> <p>16 A I do.</p> <p>17 Q And her directions to you were, "This is confidential 18 correspondence but it really scares me. Can't share 19 with Dutton."</p> <p>20 Do you know why she was worried about sharing the 21 attached correspondence with Dutton?</p> <p>22 A No, I don't. I thought it odd that she sent it to me.</p> <p>23 Q Why was it odd that she sent it to you?</p> <p>24 A Because I didn't know what it is that she was scared 25 of.</p>	<p>1 connection with operation neptune."</p> <p>2 Do you remember sending that email to him?</p> <p>3 A I don't specifically. I don't have an independent 4 memory of it.</p> <p>5 Q And then the last email you correct the typo. You 6 said, "not for 50. I meant forfeited".</p> <p>7 A Right. I sent it from my cell phone, and Siri does 8 all sorts of things with your words.</p> <p>9 Q Sure. So here on September 5 there is another 10 communication from you, directly to Mr. Owen, dealing 11 with legal advice with regard to the Government's 12 threats against him, correct?</p> <p>13 A I wouldn't necessarily call that legal advice, but it 14 was observations.</p> <p>15 Q Legal analysis?</p> <p>16 A It was my observations.</p> <p>17 Q Would you not call a statement to a client, "I believe 18 this letter was meant to intimidate but likely nothing 19 more" not to be a legal analysis of the situation?</p> <p>20 A It was my opinion, yeah.</p> <p>21 Q And so you're giving your legal opinion to Mr. Owen 22 after you claim Mr. Luskin prohibited you from having 23 contact with him that he was not a party to?</p> <p>24 A Apparently so.</p> <p>25 Q So if Mr. Luskin gave you those directions, you</p>
<p>1 (Exhibit 82 2 marked for identification.)</p> <p>3 Q Do you have Exhibit 82?</p> <p>4 A I do.</p> <p>5 Q At the very bottom is the email you sent on September 6 4, asking Mr. Owen how he was feeling today. Do you 7 see that?</p> <p>8 A Um-hum.</p> <p>9 Q And then he responds the next day saying, "Fingers 10 crossed just want the DoD drama to be over." 11 Correct?</p> <p>12 A That's what it says.</p> <p>13 Q And then you responded to him six minutes later where 14 you say, "I understand. As we discussed some time 15 ago, I believe this letter was meant to intimidate, 16 but likely nothing more. However don't be surprised 17 if NCIS does an investigation and," open quote, 18 "titles", closed quote, "you. I think however that 19 will be the extent of any criminal prosecution."</p> <p>20 New paragraph, "As far as the civil side goes 21 they may very well try to have the profits for 50. 22 However, the Government still has to be able to prove 23 that the book contains classified information or that 24 you signed a special access program/sensitive 25 apartment information non-disclosure Agreement in</p>	<p>1 200</p> <p>1 violated them?</p> <p>2 A I guess he should fire me.</p> <p>3 (Exhibit 83 4 marked for identification.)</p> <p>5 Q Do you recognize Exhibit 83 as a memo from Diane Bauer 6 in your office to you?</p> <p>7 A I do.</p> <p>8 Q And the date on it is September 6, 2012?</p> <p>9 A Yep.</p> <p>10 Q Is this the memo she sent in response to your request 11 that we marked earlier, for her to do some urgent 12 research on behalf of Mr. Bissonnette?</p> <p>13 A Yeah, I don't know if it's in response to that email 14 or not, because I think I had several emails with her, 15 but she did research and write this at my request.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. And sent it to you on September 6, 2012?</p> <p>17 A That's what it's dated, yeah.</p> <p>18 Q Is it -- since you don't -- well, I don't know if you 19 remember or not. Is it your recollection that you got 20 this shortly after you requested it?</p> <p>21 A I got it within a reasonable period of time 22 afterwards.</p> <p>23 Q I think it's actually the same day, but I may be 24 remembering it wrong. Would that be consistent with 25 your memory, that it was within a day or two of your</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

203

205

1 requesting it?

2 A If it was the same day, that would not be the Diana
3 Bauer that I know. So I think -- she's very thorough,
4 but she's also not the fastest of researchers; so I
5 don't believe it was within 24 hours of me giving her
6 the assignment.

7 Q Okay.

8 A And I think this was done at Mr. Luskin's request.

9 Q Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit 84.

10 (Exhibit 84
11 marked for identification.)

12 Q Do you recognize Exhibit 84?

13 A It looks like it's the same memo, but --

14 Q Except this time it's from you to the file, isn't it?

15 A Right.

16 Q Does it appear to you that you took her research and
17 her memo and put your name on it and then put it in
18 the file?

19 A I don't know what it appears.

20 Q Do you have any other explanation for why you would
21 take Diane Bauer's work product and put your name on
22 it and then put it in the file?

23 MR. FURMAN: Objection. It's a law firm's work
24 product. She works for a law firm.

25 A Right, and moreover you're presuming that I took her

204

206

1 work. Clearly there's a difference. There must be a
2 difference, because there were things that I didn't
3 like about what she wrote or I did further research
4 on; so yeah, there's differences in it.

5 So in any event, I don't know -- I don't recall
6 as I sit here why that was done, but I think there's
7 differences, and it's probably because I was doing a
8 revision. Since she did the work for me, I felt that
9 I was entitled to do that.

10 (Exhibit 85
11 marked for identification.)

12 Q Do you have 85 in front of you?

13 A I do.

14 Q If you go back three pages, it has attached the Diane
15 Bauer memo that was marked as Exhibit 83, I believe,
16 correct?

17 A It looks that way.

18 Q But attached to the front of that is a series of
19 emails between you and her, correct?

20 A Yeah. I don't -- well, I see that, but I don't know
21 if it's -- I don't see where -- there it is. That's
22 where she attached it to the email exchange. Got it.
23 Yep, I see that.

24 Q And if you look down at the bottom of the first page,
25 there is a request from you -- an email from you to

1 her is dated September 6 at 5:23 -- September 5 at
2 5:23 p.m.

3 A Yeah.

4 Q So in point of fact, she got it back to you almost
5 immediately, didn't she?

6 A She got it back to me, and it looks like she worked
7 through the night to do it. Wow. I take it back what
8 I said about her.

9 Q Is there any reason why this research was being done
10 after the book had been written and released, as
11 opposed to before?

12 A Well, if you look at the first email on the very back,
13 there's an email from Mr. Luskin, requesting
14 information about it.

15 Q Right.

16 A So --

17 Q And if that's the only -- let me -- is it your belief
18 that Mr. Luskin requested this research and your law
19 firm provided it?

20 A He requested the research in that email. He asked me
21 if I was familiar with royalty procedures; and while I
22 was generally, I wanted to have some specifics,
23 because attorneys tend to want to have exact answers
24 to their exact questions, and that's why the email
25 was -- I'm sorry -- that's why the research was done.

1 But prior to this, I had, like I said, from my
2 experience understood the forfeiture process, but I
3 knew there was also cases out there -- recent cases
4 where there were -- the Government had taken various
5 positions on forfeitures, and I wanted to see
6 whether -- rather, confirm my memory that the CIA was
7 much harsher with prosecuting both forfeitures
8 criminally than the DoD was. I mean, if you look at
9 the bottom of page 2, I give her a general overview.
10 And then I knew from my previous readings that these
11 cases were at issue. So I asked her to look at those
12 in particular.

13 (Exhibit 86
14 marked for identification.)

15 Q Let's continue to follow that thread just for a
16 minute. You have Exhibit 86 in front of you?

17 A Right.

18 Q And it has at the bottom of page 1 her September 6
19 memo -- email, attaching her memo, correct?

20 A Yes, that's correct.

21 Q And then the next day at 7:48 -- I presume a.m. --
22 she -- I'm sorry. At -- skipping one here,
23 September 6 at 4:51 p.m., you replied to her,
24 "Please do continue to look." Correct?

25 A Right. In answer to her previous email, I'm still

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: right;">207</p> <p>1 looking to see if there are any other materials out 2 there to help us.</p> <p>3 Q And then she says, "I will. Was the memo helpful?" 4 And then you reply on September 7, "Do you think 5 I can make these distinctions between our situation 6 and the situations in this case?"</p> <p>7 A "In these cases," correct.</p> <p>8 Q "In these cases". And then you list three 9 distinctions, correct?</p> <p>10 A It appears so, yeah; first, second, and third. Yep.</p> <p>11 Q And so prior to asking her to do this research, you 12 were not aware of whether you could make these 13 distinctions between Mr. Owen and the results in the 14 case law that were negative to authors?</p> <p>15 A Well, I wouldn't say that I was not aware. I wanted 16 her to confirm my remembrance and experience, and 17 that's what I asked her to do.</p> <p>18 Q Was your remembrance and experience that you could 19 make these distinctions?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. And did her continued research confirm that for 22 you?</p> <p>23 A You know, I don't recall. I think she did do further 24 research, but as I sit here, I don't remember what 25 exactly she came up with.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">209</p> <p>1 Information Act requests in the hope of strengthening 2 Mr. Bissonnette's position, vis-a-vis, the Government 3 and the publication of "No Easy Day"?</p> <p>4 A I think it was my suggestion and Mr. Luskin's 5 direction to do so, yeah.</p> <p>6 (Exhibit 89 7 marked for identification.)</p> <p>8 Q Do you have Exhibit 89, which it purports to be a 9 letter from you from (sic) Susan Cugler, responding to 10 her letter of September 12, denying your Freedom of 11 Information Act request?</p> <p>12 A Right and asking for reconsideration, I think. 13 (Exhibit 90 14 presented to the witness.)</p> <p>15 Q And then Exhibit 90 is a document -- and I presume it 16 is an email, but I don't have the heading on it. But 17 it is addressed to Ms. Andorfer (sic) to you, 18 talking -- telling her that you're writing in response 19 to a September 18 phone call concerning your September 20 7 letter and the requirement of agreeing to incur a 21 minimum of 500 in costs, correct?</p> <p>22 A Right. Susan Aldorfer, and she's with the Office of 23 Security Support, but it's resident in the White 24 House. I mean, that's what's up there.</p> <p>25 Q And all of this is done in furtherance of your efforts</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">208</p> <p>1 (Exhibit 87 2 marked for identification.)</p> <p>3 Q And then is the top of Exhibit 87 her reply to you, 4 "Those are certainly distinctions to make. It sounds 5 like we need to confirm exactly what documents he did 6 or did not sign. I saw an article online today which 7 said that a charitable organization has turned down 8 his offer to donate money to the organization." 9 Did you get that email from her?</p> <p>10 A It appears to be so.</p> <p>11 Q Did you get any other follow-up that you recall on 12 whether you could make the three distinctions that 13 your memory told you could be made?</p> <p>14 A As I sit here today, I don't recall. 15 (Exhibit 88 16 marked for identification.)</p> <p>17 Q Let me show you Exhibit No. 88, which purports to be a 18 letter from you to the Department of Defense, 19 requesting information under the Freedom of 20 Information Act, dated September 7. 21 Do you recall sending that letter?</p> <p>22 A Yeah, I don't know if this one exactly. This could 23 have been a draft. I don't know. I mean, yeah, 24 generally I recall doing this.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. And was it your idea to send Freedom of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">210</p> <p>1 to get information under the Freedom of Information 2 Act that would be of benefit to Mr. Bissonnette?</p> <p>3 A At Mr. Luskin's direction. 4 (Exhibit 91 5 marked for identification.)</p> <p>6 Q Do you have Exhibit 91 in front of you?</p> <p>7 A I do.</p> <p>8 Q It is a series of emails, some of them to multiple 9 people, but I'm interested primarily in the ones on 10 the front page. 11 In the middle of the page is a September 8 email 12 from Mr. Owen, talking about how they are reading his 13 version of the story. Do you see that?</p> <p>14 A Um-hum.</p> <p>15 Q And then above it is a September 8 email from you, 16 asking, "Was the mission going after Private Burgdahl 17 a special access program operation?"</p> <p>18 A Yeah.</p> <p>19 Q And then do you know who that was sent to?</p> <p>20 A I presume it was sent to Mark Owen, because that's 21 what the header says.</p> <p>22 Q And then he replies " Nope." Correct?</p> <p>23 A Right, but it could have been sent to the group, 24 because as you can see, the email chain earlier is 25 all -- yeah, this is kind of funky in that it looks</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p>211</p> <p>1 like it's being edited or something. I don't know. 2 But at a minimum, it went to him. 3 Q And if the others weren't copied on it, then once 4 again, this was you communicating with him in 5 violation of the directives that you indicated you 6 received from Mr. Luskin? 7 A Yeah, after he wrote to me. Apparently so. 8 Q And why is it that on September 8, after the book is 9 already out, you were asking for the first time 10 whether the mission involving Private Burgdahl was a 11 Special Access Program? 12 A Well, that's your characterization of it. It was the 13 first time, in fact, we had discussions about all of 14 that information that was in his book. 15 Q Okay. 16 A And I was asking him to confirm. 17 Q That's a fair question. Let me ask this then. 18 Why were you asking him on September 8 whether 19 the mission going after Burgdahl was an SAP Program? 20 A Because if you read the foregoing email, it talks 21 about one of those issues. The Burgdahl issue was 22 right there in the email from Mark Owen, and I'm just 23 confirming what he told me previously. 24 Q And when did he tell you previously whether the 25 Burgdahl mission was a SAP Operation?</p>	<p>213</p> <p>1 was written by Peter Blabber, my client, and no we did 2 not send it for official review by DoD." 3 Did you write that? 4 A As I sit here today, I don't have any independent 5 recollection of that. 6 Q Is that a true statement? 7 A It's not a complete statement. 8 Q Is it true? 9 A It's not a complete statement, so therefore it's not 10 true. 11 Q And then there is a list of three other books: 12 Dick Haney, Inside Delta -- not vetted. 13 Lieutenant Boykin, Never Surrender -- not vetted. 14 Charlie Beckwith, Delta Force -- not vetted. 15 Why did you list these three books and then put 16 "not vetted" beside them? 17 A Because it was my opinion that what was contained in 18 them was clearly not vetted, because it would not have 19 been in the books. 20 Q I don't understand. Are you saying in your opinion, 21 these books contained information that if they had 22 been vetted the review process would have removed? 23 A Yes. 24 Q Okay. So you're not saying, "These are three authors 25 I represented and they didn't vet the process."</p>
<p>212</p> <p>1 A No, it was not a SAP Operation. 2 Q Whether it was. 3 A Oh, okay. When I reviewed the manuscript, we had a 4 telephone conversation at length. So it was either 5 the first or the second telephone conversation. I 6 think it was the first conversation in June, not the 7 second one, because Kevin Maurer was on the line as 8 well; and the second conversation in June was just 9 Mark Owen and I. 10 (Exhibit 92 11 marked for identification.) 12 Q Do you have Exhibit 92 in front of you? 13 A I do. 14 Q There is an email in more or less the middle of the 15 first page from Mark Owen -- from Mark Owen to a group 16 of people that includes you, saying, "Hey guys, Was 17 just browsing through Amazon checking out all the SEAL 18 or DELTA books and I ran across this one." And then 19 it continues on. 20 Do you remember getting that email around 21 September 6? 22 A I'm sorry. As I sit here, I have no independent 23 recollection. 24 Q Then there is a reply from you to the same original 25 recipients where you say, "The Men, the Mission and Me</p>	<p>214</p> <p>1 You're saying, "These are books I have read. I don't 2 think they were vetted because they have information I 3 think should not be in there." 4 A That's correct. 5 Q Okay. 6 A It was speculation on my part. 7 Q Speculation as to whether they were vetted? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. 10 (Exhibit 93 11 marked for identification.) 12 Q Exhibit 93 is -- starts with an email from Mark 13 Fabiani that forwards a message from Rowan Scarborough 14 III, and then has a reply from you and -- a reply from 15 Fabiani, a reply from you, and then a reply from 16 Luskin. Do you remember this email exchange? 17 A As I sit here, I don't have an independent 18 recollection of it. 19 Q Do you remember -- let me ask you this. 20 In the email in the middle of the page dated 21 September 11 at 1:27 p.m. from you, it says, "DoD 22 General Counsel attached a DD Form 1847-1 to his 23 warning letter to MO which lists certain SAP's. The 24 document was signed in 2007 -- 4 years before Op. Nep 25 Spear was conceived and executed."</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p>1 By that language were you intending to say that 2 the 2007 document Mr. Owen had signed could not apply 3 to Operation Neptune Spear because it preceded the 4 operation by four years?</p> <p>5 A I wasn't saying it could not. What I was saying was 6 that -- observing a fact that it was four years before 7 the operation was conceived of and executed, so --</p> <p>8 Q What's the relevance of that timing?</p> <p>9 A Well, if you would let me finish, I would say it's 10 likely that it was not in connection with it. It 11 wasn't a continuous mission, as far as I know of facts 12 on the table. Operation Neptune Spear was conceived 13 of and executed in 2011, so it doesn't make sense that 14 a document signed in 2007 would have effect over 15 Neptune Spear.</p> <p>16 The document the Government provided has the 17 compartmented programs on it that he was read on to. 18 It's unusual, unless you are in that operation and 19 it's an ongoing operation for it to extend that many 20 years and, moreover, to cover these two different, 21 separate operations. So that was my conclusion.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And somewhere in there there is a legal premise 23 or legal analysis that I know nothing about, and 24 forgive me if I flounder a little bit here, but when 25 you sign -- when one signs a document like the</p>	<p>215</p> <p>1 additional information on it and list all of the 2 programs that one is read on, but there's nothing 3 listed on that one in 2011.</p> <p>4 So, by deductive reasoning, the 2011 program is 5 not included in that DD Form 1847-1.</p> <p>6 Q All right.</p> <p>7 (Exhibit 94)</p> <p>8 marked for identification.)</p> <p>9 Q Do you have Exhibit 94, sir?</p> <p>10 A I do.</p> <p>11 Q It is a continuation of the memo that was 93. I 12 didn't read through them, but there was an email from 13 you, said you would defer to Bob on what could be said 14 on background. And then Mr. Luskin says he'll defer 15 to you. But then the next email is the one that I'm 16 interested in, on the first page from you to 17 Mr. Luskin and Mr. Fabiani, dated September 11 at 5:58 18 p.m. where you say, "Wait. That assumes that there 19 was a Bin Laden SCI Program, which MO does not recall 20 being Read On to and which we cannot otherwise 21 confirm."</p> <p>22 If one wanted to know whether a program was an 23 SCI program, what's the best way to find out?</p> <p>24 A Go to the Security Manager for the program. The 25 access programs have code names which are not</p>
<p>1 document signed by Mr. Bissommette in 2007 that lists 2 certain SAP programs or operations, does that 3 agreement cover only those listed and would not cover 4 a future SAP program?</p> <p>5 A The Standard Form 312 is a generalized confidential 6 Non-Disclosure Agreement, and that is more or less a 7 continued obligation for all matters that are 8 classified. It's not mission specific. By its very 9 nature, Sensitive Compartmented Operation Programs are 10 mission specific. They're compartmented, meaning that 11 not everyone who is involved knows everything about 12 the mission; they know their slice.</p> <p>13 And because of their sensitive nature, those 14 persons who are signed in and read in to that program, 15 that's documented that they're signed in and they are 16 debriefed. And we have seen in this case both the 17 signing in in 2007 and a debriefing of 18 Mr. Bissommette.</p> <p>19 On there, there is two programs that were listed, 20 and he was debriefed on two programs. It was -- both 21 of them were executed in 2007 and no programs were 22 executed in 2011. So that's my conclusion, is that 23 that -- by deductive reasoning, that Operation Neptune 24 Spear was not included on that SCI program. You can 25 amend that SCI Non-Disclosure Agreement and add</p>	<p>216</p> <p>1 classified, and that's -- so Operation Neptune Spear 2 is an unclassified code name for the mission. I don't 3 know what the real mission name was. They don't 4 release that. If it's a Special Access Program, they 5 won't tell you that. But they'll be able to decipher 6 what it is from an inquiry. Whether they answer you 7 or not or have to answer you or not, that's another 8 matter. But normally, if it's in relation to a 9 security clearance matter, you'll get an answer 10 eventually.</p> <p>11 Q Would you agree with me that whether something is or 12 is not an SCI program, it's not something someone 13 would want to guess at?</p> <p>14 A Yeah, I would agree with you that one should not guess 15 at it. One should allow their attorney to talk to 16 their Security Officer to find out for sure.</p> <p>17 (Exhibit 95)</p> <p>18 marked for identification.)</p> <p>19 Q Do you have Exhibit 95 now?</p> <p>20 A I do.</p> <p>21 Q This at the top -- and again, there's an attachment to 22 it I'm concerned only about. The top of the first 23 page where you are -- I guess it doesn't say so, but 24 you must be emailing Ms. Bauer here, because she 25 replies on September 10. You say, "Please look for</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: right;">219</p> <p>1 cases addressing this issue in your research and keep 2 me posted on your progress."</p> <p>3 And then you quote the concern that was expressed 4 in the email underneath that from you to Mr. Luskin, 5 which says, "I'm a little concerned about the thought 6 that someone from the CIA will sign an affidavit 7 stating they inadvertently failed to have all of the 8 operators sign a CIA non-disclosure but gave them a 9 verbal warning telling them that the actionable 10 intelligence was derived from a SAP. I haven't found 11 any case law on it yet. But if the DoJ wanted to set 12 a precedence and use a lot of MO's royalties on legal 13 fees, that would be the way to do it," closed quotes.</p> <p>14 And so in this email you were asking Ms. Bauer to 15 do the research on that subject, correct?</p> <p>16 A I was asking her to see if she could find case law on 17 anything in connection with that, and that being that 18 there was no formal document signed but somebody came 19 forward with an affidavit and said, "Yea, verily, I 20 have briefed everyone at this level."</p> <p>21 Q And prior to this, did you -- you knew Mr. Bissonnette 22 had told you he had not signed anything, correct?</p> <p>23 A That's correct.</p> <p>24 Q Did you give any concern to whether this fact pattern 25 might have been in existence; that is to say, some CIA</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">221</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Why would he have recalled this? Had you 2 discussed this with him before you did it?</p> <p>3 A Well, this was part of that group telephone call. I 4 believe it was a telephone call, or it could have been 5 a group email. In any event, Mr. Luskin asked me to 6 do this. And this bothers me about this, because it 7 looks like I only emailed it to him, but I'm pretty 8 sure that I always copied other people on this, 9 because they had asked me to do this.</p> <p>10 But in any event, it appears that in compliance 11 with the request to send the FOIA, I did, and this was 12 the first comeback or the second comeback when they 13 said, "Well, you have to" --</p> <p>14 Q I apologize. And wouldn't it be appropriate to have 15 replied only to him since you're asking him for 16 permission to incur the copying expense?</p> <p>17 MR. FURMAN: There's a copy to Elyse Cheney, and 18 I don't know from the middle of the email who Kevin 19 Podlaski emailed it. It's not even clear that he 20 emailed Mark Owen.</p> <p>21 A That's what I'm saying. I'm not sure I just sent it 22 to him, although I addressed it to him, since he was 23 the client. But, you know, I don't know.</p> <p>24 Q Is there any other Mark you would be sending this 25 email to --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">220</p> <p>1 agent says, "We talked to them even though they didn't 2 sign anything"?</p> <p>3 A I asked him specifically if anyone had -- during their 4 briefings when they were in isolation had come in and 5 said to them that this was a Special Access Program or 6 Sensitive Compartmented Information Program, and he 7 said, "I don't think so. I don't remember. I don't 8 believe so."</p> <p>9 Q And Ms. Bauer tells you on September 13, three days 10 later, she can't find anything on that subject?</p> <p>11 A Which is not unusual, because -- well, people either 12 fight it or they don't.</p> <p>13 (Exhibit 96 14 marked for identification.) (Discussion held off the record.)</p> <p>15 Q Do you have Exhibit 96 in front of you?</p> <p>16 A I do have it in front of me, yes.</p> <p>17 Q The top -- the second email in the two-email string 18 here is dated September 18 from you, apparently to Mr. 19 Owen. Do you remember sending this email?</p> <p>20 A I have no independent recollection of it.</p> <p>21 Q In this email you say to Mr. Owen, "As you may recall, 22 I sent FOIA requests on your behalf requesting to 23 receive their reviews of 15 or so books."</p> <p>24 A I read it.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">222</p> <p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q -- asking for permission to incur the expense?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q So you sent it to Mark Owen, right?</p> <p>5 A I sent it at least to Mark Owen. I'll say that.</p> <p>6 Q And then Mark replies with a copy to Elyse saying, 7 "Yes I agree and thanks again!!!"</p> <p>8 A Apparently so.</p> <p>9 Q And if no one else was copied on your email, then this 10 would be yet one more example of you communicating 11 with Mr. Owen contrary to the directions you say 12 Mr. Luskin gave you?</p> <p>13 A No. It's not about the book. It's about the Freedom 14 of Information Act matters.</p> <p>15 Q Isn't the Freedom of Information Act about the book?</p> <p>16 A No, the Freedom of Information Act is about other 17 authors and whether their books were vetted.</p> <p>18 Q Why would Mr. Bissonnette want to pay for copies of 19 information about whether other authors had their 20 books vetted?</p> <p>21 A I don't know. You would have to ask him that.</p> <p>22 Q But you recommended it?</p> <p>23 A As we previously discussed, it was part of the group 24 session, and we were discussing about ways to support 25 Mark Owen's and Mr. Luskin's defense that he was being</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: right;">223</p> <p>1 treated unfairly from -- by the Department of Defense 2 or Department of Justice, from other authors who had 3 written books and had perhaps not submitted their 4 books for vetting and nothing happened to them. So 5 that's why.</p> <p>6 Q Didn't you tell me earlier that this was your idea? 7 A I suggested it. 8 (Exhibit 97 9 marked for identification.)</p> <p>10 Q Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit 97. 11 There's a September email -- September 18 email from 12 Mark Owen to you where he says, "I'd love to call 13 these guys!!!!"</p> <p>14 Do you know what that YouTube video is about? 15 A I have no idea. I don't recall, as I sit here.</p> <p>16 Q And then you replied to him, "If your publisher 17 doesn't have a problem with it I don't as long as you 18 don't let them record you or take photos of you," 19 correct?</p> <p>20 A That's what it says.</p> <p>21 Q And the Subject on your reply is "Unauthorized 22 interview". Does that refresh your recollection as to 23 what any of this is about?</p> <p>24 A No. I'm sorry. 25 (Discussion held off the record.)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">225</p> <p>1 then you say, "With your permission I will call him 2 and find out what he proposes."</p> <p>3 Mr. Bissonnette then replies the same day just a 4 few minute later, "Good copy!!!! Go ahead and call 5 see what they have to say."</p> <p>6 Do you recall asking Mr. Bissonnette for 7 permission to make that call and receiving directions 8 to do so?</p> <p>9 A I don't have any independent recollection of that.</p> <p>10 Q Did you make that call?</p> <p>11 A I don't remember, but I must have. I don't know. 12 (Exhibit 99 13 marked for identification.)</p> <p>14 Q Do you have Exhibit 99 in front of you?</p> <p>15 A I do.</p> <p>16 Q And the top of that is an email from Mr. Luskin to 17 you, dated September 28 at 9:23 a.m., and it 18 references an attached term sheet.</p> <p>19 Do you recall receiving this email?</p> <p>20 A I don't have any independent recollection of it.</p> <p>21 Q Do you recall receiving an email with a term sheet 22 attached?</p> <p>23 A I don't recall independently, other than what's in 24 front of me here.</p> <p>25 Q His second paragraph says, "Elyse said you had, at</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">224</p> <p>1 (Exhibit 98 2 marked for identification.)</p> <p>3 (Recess)</p> <p>4 MR. JOHNSTON:</p> <p>5 Q Do you have Exhibit 98, sir?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q At the bottom of Exhibit 98 on the first page is an 8 email from Donald Nicholson to you, dated September 9 24th.</p> <p>10 (Pause)</p> <p>11 Q Do you remember this email?</p> <p>12 A As I sit here, I don't independently recollect this 13 email.</p> <p>14 Q Do you remember receiving a response to Freedom of 15 Information Act requests on or about September 24?</p> <p>16 A No, I don't have any independent recollection.</p> <p>17 Q Then there appears to be an email from you to Mr. Owen 18 apparently, because he replies, and you wrote to him, 19 "The office of Security and Policy Review (OSPR) sent 20 this to me today informing me that the FOIA request we 21 sent to it for documents related to the OSPR's review 22 of books/manuscripts written by former military 23 members is delayed."</p> <p>24 A Yeah, I read it.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. As you read, he suggests that you call him and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">226</p> <p>1 some point, prepared a list of former seals/delta 2 force guys who had written books. Can you share that 3 w/me, please. Do you know, or does this list reflect, 4 whether any submitted their manuscripts for pre pub 5 review."</p> <p>6 Do you remember Mr. Luskin asking you for that 7 information in late September?</p> <p>8 A No, I don't recall that.</p> <p>9 Q Did you provide it to him?</p> <p>10 A I don't recall.</p> <p>11 (Exhibit 100 12 marked for identification.)</p> <p>13 Q Do you have Exhibit 100 in front of you?</p> <p>14 A I do.</p> <p>15 Q And it is an email at the bottom dated October 5 from 16 you to Mr. Bissonnette, saying, "Mark, is anything 17 going on?" Oh, I'm sorry. I skipped one.</p> <p>18 There's one of October 3rd from you to Mr. Owen 19 that says, "Subject: This is the pinnacle of success. 20 You're up there with Justin Bieber's autobiography and 21 JK Rolling's latest book. The pinnacle of success!"</p> <p>22 Do you remember sending that email to Mr. Owen?</p> <p>23 A Yeah, I think I was in a Kroger and I saw in a book 24 aisle and there his book was in the middle of the 25 aisle. So I remember sending him that, yeah.</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: right;">227</p> <p>1 Q And then two days later you send another one where you 2 say, "Mark, is anything going on?" Correct? 3 A I did. 4 Q And a couple of hours it looks like after -- almost 5 two hours after you sent it, he replies to you, "Not 6 that I know of! DoD is talking back and forth with 7 Luskin but it seems they want to negotiate a 8 reasonable settlement that allows them to back away 9 without looking bad." 10 Do you recall receiving that update on the status 11 of the negotiations from Mr. Owen? 12 A I don't recall. 13 Q And then you replied the same day back to him that 14 says, "I know, Bob Luskin sent me the list of demands. 15 I sent you a blind copy of my thoughts on it. Bottom 16 line: I think you should do nothing except apologize 17 and maybe donate some money to charity of DoD's 18 choice! Did you get my photos?" 19 And that email is dated October 5, 2012, correct? 20 A Yes. 21 Q When it says, "I sent you a blind copy of my thoughts 22 on it," what does that mean? 23 A As I sit here today, I don't recall. 24 Q Does that mean that you sent it to him and not to 25 Luskin?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">229</p> <p>1 of that and they may not be in the "cc" block. 2 They're in the "bcc" block, so they receive a copy of 3 your communications. But it doesn't mean that it was 4 sent only to Mr. Owen. I think it means it was sent 5 to both of them, primarily to Mr. Luskin and then 6 blind copy to Mr. Owen. That's what I would presume 7 it to be. 8 Q I understand your point. So your belief is that you 9 sent your observations to Mr. Luskin and blind copied 10 on that transmission Mr. Bissonnette, so he would have 11 received it, but Mr. Luskin would not know that you 12 had sent it to him? 13 A I don't know that for sure, but that's what blind 14 copying would mean to me. 15 Q Okay. I understand now. Let me show you Exhibit 101. 16 (Exhibit 101 17 marked for identification.) 18 Q This is an email dated November 13 to you, with a 19 reference to Freedom of Information ACT request and a 20 number. "Dear Mr. Podlaski, the FBI" and then they 21 respond and say, "Your request will be processed." 22 Do you recall receiving that notification that a 23 Freedom of Information Act request to the FBI would be 24 processed? 25 A No, I really don't.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">228</p> <p>1 A As I sit here today, I don't recall. 2 Q And then he replies to you still on October 5, "I got 3 the pictures!!! Thank you!!!" 4 Do you know what pictures are being talked about? 5 A I don't know for sure, but I think it's the pictures 6 of his book in Kroger's. 7 Q Okay. "As for the demands they are still working 8 through the list but none of them seem too crazy so 9 that's a good thing." 10 Do you recall that communication? 11 A I don't have an independent recollection, no. 12 Q This would, again, be communications between you and 13 him about the subject of his books and his Government 14 problems over the book that would be in violation of 15 Mr. Luskin's directions, as you understood them, for 16 you to not discuss the matter with him without 17 Mr. Luskin present, correct? In part? 18 A Yeah, in part we did discuss the DoD negotiations. 19 Q And would you agree with me that if your reference to 20 sending him a blind copy of your thoughts means you 21 excluded Mr. Luskin, that would really be in violation 22 of what you say Mr. Luskin told you, correct? 23 A No, I don't agree with your premise and your 24 presumption. Blind copying normally means that you 25 are talking to one person and you send a person a copy</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">230</p> <p>1 Q Let me ask you to look at the bottom of page 1, and 2 earlier there is a reference to an earlier 3 transmission by minutes from you to FOIPA Request. 4 A I'm sorry. What are you referring to by minutes? 5 Q Yeah. Look up at the top of David Sobonya's email to 6 you, November 13, 10:49 a.m., right? 7 A Correct. 8 Q Now go down and look at your transmission. 9 A I see what you're saying. 10 Q It's November 13, 10:41. 11 A Yeah, I just didn't understand what you said. I got 12 it. 13 Q Sure. So it appears you sent it, and eight minutes 14 later he replied and said it's being processed, 15 correct? 16 A Correct. 17 Q And so did you on November 13 send the FBI a request 18 for documents under the Freedom of Information Act, as 19 reflected in Exhibit 101? 20 A It appears to be so. 21 Q And this is essentially the same request that you sent 22 in September, just to a different entity, correct? 23 A I would have to compare them, but they appear to be 24 similar. 25 Q And this was another request that you sent on behalf</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	231	233
<p>1 of or for the benefit of Mr. Bissonnette?</p> <p>2 A Per the direction of Mr. Luskin, correct.</p> <p>3 (Exhibit 102</p> <p>4 marked for identification.)</p> <p>5 Q Do you have Exhibit 102 in front of you?</p> <p>6 A I do.</p> <p>7 Q This appears to be an email exchange between you and</p> <p>8 Kevin Maurer, the co-writer. On January 8, 2013 you</p> <p>9 wrote, "I just finished reading The Lions of</p> <p>10 Kandahar."</p> <p>11 What is that book? What's that book about?</p> <p>12 A Oh, it's about a -- I testified earlier that</p> <p>13 apparently Rusty Bradley, he was a Special Forces</p> <p>14 ODA -- Operational Detachment Alpha -- Commander for</p> <p>15 the 5th Special Forces Group, and he was in</p> <p>16 Afghanistan and wrote a book about his experiences.</p> <p>17 And actually in that regard, the Command -- I think it</p> <p>18 was General Mulholland -- asked him to write it. And</p> <p>19 it was a pretty good, fast-moving book.</p> <p>20 Q And you may have said this, but was Mr. Maurer a</p> <p>21 co-writer on it?</p> <p>22 A Yeah, he was the co-writer.</p> <p>23 Q All right. And then you ask, "How are things going?</p> <p>24 Haven't heard from MO or Elyse in quite a while. I</p> <p>25 presume the storm has calmed down? Let me know."</p>	<p>1 same day, May the 8th, saying, "Alex, please tell me</p> <p>2 why you need these documents."</p> <p>3 A Yeah, it looks like it was my response.</p> <p>4 Q And then he replied, "Mark has requested them. My</p> <p>5 understanding is that he paid the associated</p> <p>6 administrative costs (copying, etc.) in advance back</p> <p>7 in September."</p> <p>8 A Yeah. That's not the way it works.</p> <p>9 Q No, it's not. But why were you asking why Alex needed</p> <p>10 the documents?</p> <p>11 A Because I didn't work for Alex and I didn't work for</p> <p>12 Elyse. I worked for Mr. Owen and then was working</p> <p>13 with Mr. Luskin.</p> <p>14 Q Okay.</p> <p>15 (Exhibit 104</p> <p>16 marked for identification.)</p> <p>17 Q 104 is an email from Krista Witmer. That's the woman</p> <p>18 who worked at Carson Boxberger for you -- or maybe for</p> <p>19 others, correct?</p> <p>20 A Yeah.</p> <p>21 Q And it's dated, again, the same date, Wednesday, May</p> <p>22 8th, with attachments, and it says, "Mark Owen</p> <p>23 documents."</p> <p>24 A Um-hum.</p> <p>25 Q After you received this request from Alex Jacobs for</p>	
	232	234
<p>1 A I did say that, yeah, as this reflects.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And do you remember this email exchange?</p> <p>3 A I don't have any independent recollection of it, no.</p> <p>4 Q All right.</p> <p>5 (Exhibit 103</p> <p>6 marked for identification.)</p> <p>7 Q And Exhibit 103 is an email from Alex Jacobs to you</p> <p>8 with the Subject: Mark Owen FOIA, dated May the 8th.</p> <p>9 Do you remember this communication?</p> <p>10 A Yeah, I thought this was odd. I got this from this</p> <p>11 guy who only had but one, I think, interface with him,</p> <p>12 and he was asking me to give him an update on the FOIA</p> <p>13 information.</p> <p>14 Q And he says, "We can't seem to find it in our</p> <p>15 records."</p> <p>16 Had you reported the response you had received by</p> <p>17 that time?</p> <p>18 A As I sit here today, I don't have any independent</p> <p>19 recollection of whether I had received the response or</p> <p>20 not. And I also don't know if I ever responded to</p> <p>21 this. I probably did.</p> <p>22 Q Let me show you what's marked as 106.</p> <p>23 (Exhibit 106</p> <p>24 marked for identification.)</p> <p>25 Q Does 106 appear to be your reply to Mr. Jacobs on the</p>	<p>1 the FOIA stuff, did you ask Ms. Witmer to assemble all</p> <p>2 of those documents for you?</p> <p>3 A I did.</p> <p>4 Q And then behind it is a series of letters addressed to</p> <p>5 you.</p> <p>6 A Right.</p> <p>7 Q Correct?</p> <p>8 A Yeah.</p> <p>9 Q All dealing with the FOIA requests?</p> <p>10 A Yeah. They took my letter and broke down -- "they"</p> <p>11 being -- apparently the FBI took my letter and broke</p> <p>12 down each individual item and prepared a separate</p> <p>13 response.</p> <p>14 Q So they treated it as like 20 requests instead of one</p> <p>15 request?</p> <p>16 A That's my understanding.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. And did you supply this information then to</p> <p>18 Alex after he told you why he wanted it?</p> <p>19 A As I sit here today, I don't know if I did, but I</p> <p>20 think that would be the reason why I asked her to put</p> <p>21 these together for me.</p> <p>22 (Exhibit 105</p> <p>23 marked for identification.)</p> <p>24 Q Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit 105. This</p> <p>25 would be the day after you received the email from</p>	

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

	235		237
1	Alex. Well, actually it's the same day; at the bottom 2 it's dated May 8th. There is an email from you to 3 Ms. Aldorfer, saying, "I have not received any further 4 correspondence from you with regard to the FOIA 5 request submitted in September, with the exception of 6 the following update."	1	recollection of it.
7	A That's weird.	2	Q And then there is a reply starting in the middle of 3 the page from Mr. Owen to you, copying Alex Jacobs and 4 Tamera Watt, correct?
8	Q So after you received Alex's request, did you contact 9 Ms. Aldorfer to follow up on why you had not received 10 a response from the September 12 FOIA requests?	5	A Yes.
11	A Apparently so. But this email bothers me in that I 12 would not have sent Mr. Nichelson, as a standard 13 procedure, the email from Ms. Aldorfer, because I 14 don't even think they were in the same organization. 15 Maybe they were. Yeah.	6	Q Again, dated May 9, "Thanks for the help. Please feel 7 free to communicate with both Alex and Tamera, both 8 cc'd above in to this situation. They are organizing 9 the pertinent info and taking lead on this. Thanks 10 again! Matt."
16	Q Well, it may be that Ms. Aldorfer gave it to him, not 17 you. Because he is the one that replies, correct?	11	And then he says, "Our next meeting with DoD is 12 the 16th, is there anyway chance we'll hear back from 13 this enquiry before then?"
18	A Yes, he does. He does "cc" her.	14	Still on May 9 you reply, "Not likely. What does 15 DoD want from you?"
19	Q He says, "I'm the officer on your request. Upon 20 completion of the review, documents will be 21 processed."	16	And his reply only to you with no copies, "100% 17 of book profits."
22	A Oh, okay. My bad.	18	And then a reply from you to him, "Bastards. Are 19 they getting McRaven's/Bowden's profits?"
23	Q So did you ever receive a further response after this 24 May 9 email from Mr. Nichelson?	20	And then the last email in the chain from Mr. 21 Owen to you, "Of course not!!! Had a long talk last 22 night with Leon P at an event I was at, and he didn't 23 even know they were still coming after me. WTF."
25	A As I sit here, I have no independent recollection of	24	Do you remember that email exchange with Mr. Owen 25 on or about May 9?
	236		238
1	that, but the fact that it took months doesn't 2 surprise me. The Government moves at a glacial pace 3 for the most part.	1	A I honestly do not. I don't have any independent 2 recollection of it other than what's here.
4	Q Let me show you Exhibit 107. 5 (Exhibit 107 6 marked for identification.)	3	Q Would you disagree with the conclusion that the 4 September, November 2012 and May 2013 communications 5 concerning Freedom of Information Act requests that 6 you sent and then reported on for the benefit of 7 Mr. Bissonnette evidence a continuing attorney-client 8 relationship with him for that period of time and 9 those events?
7	Q And I will tell you, if you turn to the second page 8 you can see that it is in the chain from your email to 9 Ms. Aldorfer. Mr. Nickels (sic) replied to you, and 10 then there is, on page 1 and going on to page 2, an 11 email from you. It appears to be to Mr. Owen, dated 12 May 9, where you said, "I hope all is well. Contact 13 me at your convenience to discuss the status of your 14 situation."	10	A I think that I was closing up on a last, lingering 11 issue for a relationship that clearly was over by 12 then, and so I was just doing some finish work of 13 something I had started in September, and that is to 14 get the Freedom of Information Act materials to them.
15	"Alex said you wanted an update on FOIA. I've 16 included below the email exchange. I will shortly 17 send you my request and answer from the FBI for same 18 materials."	15	Q September to DoD and then November to FBI, correct?
19	And then, "For the record, billing for producing 20 materials pursuant to a FOIA request is not sent until 21 the Agency responds with materials. Here, no fees 22 have yet been demanded. This is the status."	16	A That is correct.
23	Did you send that update to Mr. Owen on or about 24 May 9?	17	Q Mr. Podlaski, are you proud of your representation of 18 Mr. Bissonnette and the job you did for him?
25	A Apparently so, but I don't have any independent	19	A I think so. I provided him with the information that 20 he requested of me and provided him with advice based 21 upon the information that he provided to me.
		22	Q Blessed with hindsight, is there anything you would do 23 different?
		24	A You know, hindsight being 20/20 and seeing all of the 25 hassle that all of this has occurred, I would have

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

<p style="text-align: right;">239</p> <p>1 told him, "Tell your publisher you can't meet your 2 deadline," and that I would recommend as the safest 3 course and emphasize again to him to submit the book, 4 "Because you are" -- as I told him, "You're taking a 5 chance on not submitting the book, and they can always 6 prosecute you and make you spend a lot of money 7 defending yourself, even if you come out a winner in 8 the end."</p> <p>9 Q Longer for me than for you, but both of us were in law 10 school and were graded. Using a scale of 100, what 11 grade would you give yourself on your representation 12 of Mr. Bissonnette?</p> <p>13 A I don't understand the relevance of that question, so 14 I don't -- I'm not going to answer.</p> <p>15 Q Would you give yourself a passing grade?</p> <p>16 A Same answer.</p> <p>17 MR. JOHNSTON: Let's take a break and I may be 18 through.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>20 MR. JOHNSTON: At least I'm close to through, I 21 know.</p> <p>22 (Recess)</p> <p>23 BY MR. JOHNSTON:</p> <p>24 Q Mr. Podlaski, do you agree with me that up until the 25 time of the signing of the Consent Decree, the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">241</p> <p>1 state is.</p> <p>2 Q Let me direct your attention to the Tolling Agreement 3 that was executed in this case back in August of 2014. 4 Did you have any role in the negotiation of the 5 Tolling Agreement?</p> <p>6 A No, I just -- I spoke to my then-attorney, Robert 7 Shannon, about it, but I didn't -- wasn't actively 8 involved in that.</p> <p>9 Q Did you have any intent with regard to the -- there 10 was put in to the Tolling Agreement a -- what I will 11 call a non-disparagement clause. Are you aware of 12 that?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. When the document was negotiated, did you have 15 an intent that a violation of the non-disparagement 16 clause would stop tolling as of the date of the 17 violation and terminate the tolling?</p> <p>18 A Yeah, I recall now. I specifically spoke with Robert 19 Shannon about --</p> <p>20 MR. BROWN: Wait a minute. You've got privilege 21 with Mr. Shannon. I don't know whether you're trying 22 to ask him questions about it. I assume you're not, 23 but I'm assuming you read the agreement and were 24 familiar with what it said when it was executed.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">240</p> <p>1 situation with the Government could have been fixed 2 for Mr. Bissonnette?</p> <p>3 A I don't know what you mean by "fixed".</p> <p>4 Q Make the problem go away, not have to forfeit the 5 money, not be sued by them?</p> <p>6 A Put in what context? Could have been fixed by whom, 7 when?</p> <p>8 Q By lawyers representing him.</p> <p>9 A I don't know -- I guess I need more information than 10 that. It's a very broad statement. Specifically, 11 what are you referring to? Are you saying fixed by 12 me?</p> <p>13 Q Well, maybe by you. I don't know. Fixed by lawyers 14 representing him dealing with the Government, who 15 could have persuaded the Government that either he 16 didn't have an obligation, if your theories were 17 right, or if he did have an obligation, that it was an 18 innocent mistake made by reliance on a lawyer who 19 relied upon the best information he had available at 20 the time, or any -- or that he was being singled out 21 for disparate treatment as compared to others, or any 22 other theory that the Government might accept? It 23 could have been, if not resolved totally, ameliorated 24 in some fashion?</p> <p>25 A I don't know. I don't know what the Government's mind</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">242</p> <p>1 Q Was it your understanding -- and I want to get to the 2 60 Minutes interview in a minute. Was it your 3 understanding that if Mr. Bissonnette violated the 4 Tolling Agreement, tolling would stop on the day of 5 that violation?</p> <p>6 MR. BROWN: I'm going to object to the form of 7 the question as the document speaks for itself, 8 subject to legal interpretation.</p> <p>9 But you can go ahead and answer.</p> <p>10 A I'll tell you that was my understanding.</p> <p>11 Q Now let me move to the 60 Minutes interview. Did you 12 watch the 60 Minutes interview when it aired?</p> <p>13 A I did.</p> <p>14 Q And have you watched it since then?</p> <p>15 A I have not.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. So you've watched it only the one time?</p> <p>17 A I believe so.</p> <p>18 MR. BROWN: For the record, there were two 60 19 Minutes.</p> <p>20 MR. JOHNSTON: We're talking only about the 2014 21 one.</p> <p>22 MR. BROWN: Okay.</p> <p>23 Q Was that your understanding, I was talking only about 24 2014?</p> <p>25 A Yeah, I think I understood that was implied in your</p>

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

243	245
1 question. 2 Q Sure. In that 60 Minutes interview, did you ever hear 3 your name mentioned? 4 A No, I did not hear my name mentioned. 5 Q Or the name of Carson Boxberger? 6 A No, I did not hear the name of Carson Boxberger. 7 However, Mr. Bissonnette did say and his attorney said 8 that his attorneys gave him bad advice. 9 Q And – but the attorneys to whom they were referring 10 were not named in the program, were they? 11 A No, but it was contemporaneous all over the internet 12 that I had represented him by then. 13 Q Following the airing of the 60 Minutes interview, did 14 anyone call you to say anything about, "Oh, I saw you 15 being talked about on TV last night or last week"? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Who did? 18 A News reporters. 19 Q After the interview or before? 20 A After. 21 Q Okay. And do you know how they got your name? 22 A They just went on the internet to see all the 23 different news stories about the matter, and it was 24 within, I'd say, three to five days afterwards that I 25 started getting phone calls.	1 you know, when they got me on the phone, they said 2 something, and I said, "You need to talk to my 3 attorney." That's all I said. 4 Q And that was Mr. Shannon at that time? 5 A I believe it was, yeah, Robert Shannon at the time. 6 MR. JOHNSTON: All right. We'll reserve the 7 remainder of our questions until the time of trial. 8 9 10 AND FURTHER THE DEPONENT SAITH NOT. 11 12 13 KEVIN PODLASKI 14 15 END TIME: 5:42 P.M. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25
244	246
1 Q And do you know if Carson Boxberger got any calls, or 2 were they all directed to you? 3 A I understand from my former partners that they 4 received at least one phone call as well. 5 Q Okay. Were you contacted by the -- by a producer at 6 60 Minutes prior to the airing? 7 A Never. 8 Q Mr. Shannon provided a letter to 60 Minutes that was 9 aired as a part of the program, correct? 10 A I don't recall that. I'm sorry. I just don't 11 remember it. 12 Q Okay. Did you ever ratify -- you're going to think 13 this is silly, but I really have a serious purpose. 14 Did you ever confirm or ratify to anyone that you 15 were the lawyer Mr. Bissonnette was talking about from 16 whom he had received bad advice? 17 A I have never publicly stated that. I've not made any 18 newspaper -- I've not had anybody interview me, and I 19 haven't confirmed that. 20 Q And when the press called, you did not confirm for 21 them that you were the lawyer they were talking 22 about -- or one of the lawyers they were talking 23 about? 24 A That's correct. I mean, they called me up and a 25 couple of them didn't say who they were at first and,	1 STATE OF INDIANA) 2 COUNTY OF MARION) 3 4 I, Karen K. Keim, CRR, RPR, CSR-IL, CCR-MO, 5 Notary Public, do hereby certify that KEVIN PODLASKI, 6 the deponent herein, was first duly sworn to tell the 7 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in 8 the aforementioned matter; 9 That the foregoing deposition was taken on 10 behalf of the Plaintiff, at Kightlinger & Gray, 11 LLP, One Indiana Square, Suite 300, 211 North 12 Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, on 13 November 17, 2016, pursuant to Rule 30 of the Federal 14 Rules of Civil Procedure; 15 That said deposition was taken down in 16 stenograph notes and afterwards reduced to typewriting 17 under my direction, and that the typewritten 18 transcript is a true record of the testimony given by 19 the said deponent; and that signature was reserved by 20 the deponent and all parties present; 21 That the parties were represented by their 22 counsel as aforementioned. 23 I do further certify that I am a 24 disinterested person in this cause of action, that I 25 am not a relative or attorney of either party or

Kevin Podlaski - November 17, 2016

247

1 otherwise interested in the event of this action; and
2 that I am not in the employ of the attorneys for any
3 party.

4 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
5 this 21st day of November, 2016.

6

7

8

9

10 Karen K. Keim
Certified Realtime Reporter
11 Illinois CSR No. 84-1577
Missouri CCR No. 1328

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25